

# THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

OCTOBER, 1917.

## ADNOTANDA IN LATIN PROSODY.

### I. *diutius*.

THE statement in the second-and-third edition of Sommer's excellent *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (1914), p. 462, that the oldest scansion is *diūtius*, to say nothing of the unqualified assertion in our current grammars and dictionaries<sup>1</sup> that the *u* in it and in *diūtissime* is long or the regrettable silence of the principal editors of Plautus upon the subject, is of itself sufficient warrant for a brief discussion. The relevant facts are these:

1. Though *diu* is common enough in verse of all kinds, the comparative is not attested for any but writers in iambs, while the superlative appears to be confined to prose.

2. *diutius* is found

(a) (i.) At the end of an iambic or trochaic line in the following passages:  
Plautus *Trin.* 685

sicut dixi faciam; nolo te iactari *diutius*

Terence *Haut.* 102

cottidie accusabam: 'hem tibi ne haec *diutius*'

Similarly in Ter. *Haut.* 424; 834; *Phorm.* 569; *Hec.* 148. Pacuvius *fr.* 181; Afranius *fr.* 49.

Phaedrus 1. 2. 16

hoc mersum limo cum iaceret *diutius*

(ii.) In other places of the line:

Ter. *Phorm.* 182

nam non potest celari nostra *diutius* iam audacia

Pomponius *fr.* 21

'non esuribis *diutius*.' 'qua re?' rogas

Laberius *fr.* 62

dum *diutius* retinetur, nostri oblitus est

Phaedrus 3 *epilog.* 14

fruar *diutius* si celerius cepero

<sup>1</sup> Including the new edition of Georges (1913) read '*diūturnus*,'  
'*diūtius* bei älteren Dichtern' in which we also

The remaining example known to me is Turpilius *fr.* 62 *ap. Non.* 215. 26 (Lindsay):

set néqueo ferre hunc *diutius*  
erráre et conquerí nec esse suáe parum obsequéllae.

(b) Plautus *Rudens* 93 in the traditional text, which with its context is as follows:

PLESIDIPPVS. et uos a uostris abduxi negotiis,  
neque id processit qua uos duxi gratia, 90  
neque quiui ad portum lenonemprehendere.  
sed mea desidia spem deserere nolui.  
eo uos, amici, detinui *diutius*.  
nunc huc ad Veneris fanum uenio uisere  
ubi rem diuinam se facturum dixerat.

3. Of minor importance are the quantities of certain related words, to wit (a) *diū* (b) *diūtīnus* (c) *diūtūrnus*.

The lines cited under 2 (a) cannot be scanned if the word had the quantity which it appears to have in 2 (b). They can be scanned if the *u* is short, or again, if, supposing it to be long, the *i* is got rid of by the hypothesis that it is consonantized or absorbed. The latter trisyllabic scansion, though advocated by Ritschl on *Trin.* 685 citing Fleckeisen *Jahrb.* 101 (1870) 69 sqq., has been rightly condemned by L. Mueller *de re metrica* 431 and Havet *Phaedr.* p. 214. It lies exposed to two grave objections. It assumes a change at the threshold of a word without example or analogy in historic Latin; and it provides no explanation of the avoidance of the word in dactylic metres, for which it would have been as convenient as *longius* or *saepius*.

The conclusion to which we are forced is that in the long list of passages which I have cited the scansion is *diūtīus*. This brings Plautus *Rudens* 93 into sharp conflict with *Trinummus* 685. As a lengthening of *diūtīus* to *diūtīus* is out of the question, the difficulty can only be resolved by supposing that *Rudens* 93 is corrupt. Dziatzko proposed *detiniui*, the grammarian Charisius having told us that the *ueteres* used *tenius* for *tenui* 3. 1 p. 220 (*Gramm. Lat.* I. 248 2 Keil). We might also insert *tum* after *amici*, which would improve the passage by providing an antithesis to *nunc* in the following line.

Too much has been made of the discrepancies in the related words. *diūtīus* by the side of *diū* need not trouble us more than *maledīcentior* by the side of *maledīcus* and a stem *dīūt-* is attested also for *dīūt-urnus*, a formation like *noct-urnus*, *tacit-urnus*. It may be observed in passing that *diuturnus* 'long lasting,' applicable to persons as well as things, is not a simple synonym of *diutinus* which means rather 'long extended' 'lengthy,' and this latter adjective can be derived without offence from *diū*, as *cras-tinus* from *cras*, *pris-tinus* from *\*pris* (= *prius*, cf. *pris-cus*) and the late *sero-tinus* from *sero*.

II. *attodisse* or *attudisse*?

In the Appendix Vergiliana lines 6 sqq. of *Catalepton* 10 appear in recent editions as follows:

et hoc negat Tryphonis aemuli domum  
negare nobilem insulamue Caeruli  
ubi iste post Sabinus ante Quintio  
bidente dicet *attodisse* forfice (edd. forcipe)  
comata colla ne Cytorio iugo 10  
premente dura uulnus ederet iuba.

*attodisse* is the reading of all the MSS. except the oldest. It is incompatible, it is true, with the metre; but it is at least a Latin perfect and it gives the required sense. What are we to say of *attodisse* which the recommendation of Buecheler and the spell of the Bruxellensis have imported into the text? This: that *attodisse*, if it were a Latin form at all, should have a long vowel, as *odi fodi* and so forth have, and would therefore be no better for the verse than its discredited rival; and that *attodi* will be the perfect of *attondeo* when *respodī* is the perfect of *respondeo*.

Now it is the case that *tondeo* was confused with *tundo* in popular speech as is shown by a rustic calendar in *C.I.L.* I. p. 28 (2nd ed.) OVES TVNDVNT LANA LAVATVR and W. Heraeus on the Appendix Probi *Archiv* XI. p. 325 (cf. Sommer *Handbuch* p. 66). So it seems possible that we should write *attudisse*. But there is another possibility. *atto(n)dise* may be a gloss on the original word which a passage of the younger Pliny may then help us to restore *Ep.* 7. 27. 12 'Is uisus sibi cernere quendam in toro residentem admouentemque capiti suo cultros atque etiam ex ipso uertice *amputantem* capillos. ubi inluxit, ipse circa uerticem tonsus, capilli iacentes reperiuntur.' *amputasse* with *colla* only would have a different sense, Seneca *Thyestes* 727; but 'comata colla' is the equivalent of *capillos* which the metre would not admit. I may explain in concluding that I have preferred the *forfice* of Heyne to the *forcipe* of the MSS. and the editors, since it is more likely that the nags were clipped with a pair of shears than with a pair of tongs.

III. *natrīx* 'watersnake.'

A recent paper in *Classical Philology* in which much pains and ingenuity are spent on recommending a double false quantity in Plautus<sup>1</sup> may well serve as a warning not to put too much trust in dictionaries.

In spite of Quicherat and Lewis neither of the vowels of this word is long, as can be seen from Lucilius *ap. Non.* 65. 29 'si natibus *natricem* impressit crassam et capitatam' and, as I shall presently show, inferred from Lucan 9. 720 'et *natrīx* uiolator aquae,' the only two places where it occurs in Latin verse, while the shortness of the first vowel is vouched for by its congeners in

<sup>1</sup> *natricis* for *nātrīcis* Bauck. 434.

other Indo-European languages, e.g. English 'adder' formerly *nadder* and in Scotch and other dialects *nadder* still.

In the improper use of *natrrix* by Lucilius the gender is feminine,<sup>1</sup> but masculine in the proper use of Lucan. Other passages are indecisive; Cicero *Acad.* 2. 120 'tantam uim *natricum* uiperarumque,' Columella 1. 5. 6 '*natricum* serpentiumque pestes,' Seneca *Dial.* 4. 31. 8 'ne uiperas quidem et *natrices*,' Suetonius *Calig.* 11 where it is applied to Caligula, nor can we infer anything from its transference to denote a plant Pliny *N.H.* 27. 107 '*natrrix* uocatur herba cuius' e.q.s. The only other occurrence of it that I know is in a collection of glosses on Juvenal, Corp. Gl. V. p. 656. 32 '*Natricem* explodit serpentem excludit et expellit.' This glossary, while mainly drawn from the extant *Satires*, includes accretions from other sources, and one of such must the present gloss be. '*natricem* explodit' might be a fragment of a hexameter; and, since *explodere* in the sense of *expellere* (cf. Seneca *Dial.* 6. 10. 6 'fortuna luctatos cum fluctibus ne in harenam quidem aut litus *explodet* sed in alicuius immensae uentrem beluae decondet') seems to belong to familiar speech possibly also from Lucilius.<sup>2</sup>

We cannot of course argue from Lucan's use that the masculine gender of *natrrix* was the common or exclusive one in his time; but we may feel confident that he would not have coupled '*uiolator aquae*' with a noun which, like '*nātrix*,' could not have failed to suggest to his ear and to his readers' ears a feminine verbal substantive.

When precisely arose the mispronunciation to which we owe the confusion that still obsesses our lexicographers it is not possible to say; but we find it established in Priscian (II. p. 165. 11 sq. Keil) 'In *ix*, si paenultima brevis est masculina sunt: "hic calix," "hic uarix," excipitur "haec salix" et haec filix . . . alia uero feminina sunt haec "*mātrix*," "*cōrnix*," "*lōdix*" et omnia uerbalia ut "*uictrix*," "*nutrix*," "*meretrix*," "*natrrix*," quod tamen cum speciem anguis significat masculini quoque inuenitur: Lucanus in VIII 'et *natrrix uiolator aquae*'; and so Phocas (*Gramm. Lat.* V. 421. 15 Keil).

#### IV. *abies*, etc.: *abiit*, etc.: *Anien*, *lien*, *rien*.

##### 1. *abiēs*, *ariēs*, *pariēs*.

I do not suppose I am the first to wonder why these three nominatives, all of the form *uu-*, have dissociated themselves in the quantity of their final syllable from the rest of the class with genitives ending in *-etis* or *-itis*. But I imagine that the fiction of the 'Vowel Lengthened in *arsi*,' reinforced perhaps by the fact that in their oblique cases they were assisted into verse by means of another 'poetic licence,' has stifled the desire for further inquiry. It may

<sup>1</sup> The gender may be due to the sense intended, as in the *mas* of Catullus 56. 7 or the *haec* of Petronius 24 fin.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Lindsay, whose attention I drew to this gloss, thinks it may be a contamination

of two glosses '*natricem serpentem*' and '*explodit excludit et expellit*' or, if a single gloss perhaps a scrap from a Christian poet's hexameter.

be a  
abie  
have  
diffi

roma  
that  
cons  
occa  
begin  
sylla  
supp  
(ib. p  
and  
equē  
answ  
simil  
last s

2  
1  
had b  
above  
vowel  
occur  
that t  
interi  
have t

In  
and th  
deficie  
whose  
pensab  
abiit, j  
before  
(Manil  
except  
p. 399  
attemp  
poet's  
written  
ruptis

<sup>1</sup> For  
man's co



be as well to say plainly at the outset that, if the original quantity had been *abiēs*, *ariēs*, *pariēs*, there is not the slightest reason why that quantity should have been changed. The poorest writer of dactyls would have had no difficulty in finding them a place in his verse.

Since M. Havet published his paper on *L'S latin caduc* in the *Études romanes* dedicated to Gaston Paris, pp. 303 sqq., it has been generally recognized that in Early Latin the *s* which arose from the concurrence of two final consonants, as *ts*, *ds*, *ss*, had a different value from the simple *s* shown by the occasional length of the last syllable, as in 'miles inpransus' *Aul.* 528, the beginning of an iambic trimeter and *es* from *sum*<sup>1</sup> which always forms a long syllable in Plautus, and the fact that in this case the consonant is never suppressed at the end of a word like an originally single *s* as in *bonu' sum* (ib. pp. 320 sq.). This double *s* was soon simplified first before consonants and later before vowels and the stages may be marked as follows: *equēts*, *equēs*, *equēs*. Why did not *abiess*, *ariess*, *pariess* take the same route? The answer seems to be that they were attracted to the numerous words with similar ending and scansion such as *āctēs*, *fāclēs*, *spēcīēs*, in which the *e* of the last syllable was long.

2. *abiūt*, *adiūt*, *coiūt*, *iniūt*, *obiūt*, *periūt*, *rediūt*, *subiūt*; *petiūt*.

To the shortening of final syllables closed by any consonant but *s* which had been consummated by the classical period, the anapaestic perfects cited above are a sole and singular exception. Actual proof of the length of the vowel cannot be produced for *coiūt*, *iniūt* and *obiūt* as these do not happen to occur before an initial vowel in verse; but it would be perverse to maintain that they were in disaccord with the other compounds of *iūt*. We should add *interiūt* and *praeteriūt*, compounds ending in an anapaest, for both of which we have the authority of Ovid: *Met.* 3. 546, *Ars Am.* 3. 63, 64, *Met.* 14. 101.

In sharp contrast to these stand perfects in which the preposition is long and the final syllable short: to wit *exiūt*, and *trānsiūt* to which but for the deficiencies of the record *prodiūt* would presumably be added. Lachmann, whose note on *Lucr.* 3. 1042 is for all its arbitrary theorizing still indispensable, would not tolerate either *exiūt* or *iūt* being of a quantity different from *abiūt*, just as he refused to Lucretius the liberty of placing the contracted *obiūt* before a consonant, although in the very same note he cites five examples (Manilius and Martial) of *desiūt*, the contraction of *desiūt*, which is never found except in this position. Lachmann imposed upon L. Mueller, *de re metrica* p. 399; but he did not impose on Munro (*Lucr. l.c.*), who writes of Lachmann's attempts to foist *exiūt* and *trānsiūt* upon Vergil: 'Taking then into account the poet's usual rhythm it seems almost incredible that he should five times have written *exiūt*, *exiūt*, *trānsiūt*, *trānsiūt*, *trānsiūt*' [*G.* 2. 81, *A.* 2. 497 'non sic aggeribus ruptis cum spumeus amnis | *exiūt*, oppositasque euicit gurgite moles | fertur in

<sup>1</sup> For the form *ess* compare Mr. A. W. Hodgman's collection in *Classical Quarterly* 1. 1907, p. 107.

arua furens cumulo;’ *A.* 5. 274, 10. 785, 817 ‘*transiit* et parmam mucro, leuia arma minacis’]; ‘never once divided the word between two feet, *exit*, etc.; nor used it in the sixth foot.’ Lachmann’s treatment of Silius 13. 166 and Tibullus 1. 4. 27 is hardly less perverse. In the first passage ‘*mediam tunc transiit* ictu | parmam sed grato fraudatast sanguine cuspis’ he rejects *transiit*, supported though it is by the Vergilian parallel and another from Silius himself 10. 251 sq. ‘*conixus in hastam | ilia cornipedis subrecta cuspide transiit*’ and vouched for by the Coloniensis, for the facile *transigit* of inferior MSS. The passage of Tibullus I dealt with in connexion with Horace *carm.* 4. 4. 65 ‘*merses profundo pulcrior euenit*,’ where for the corrupt *euenit* I suggested<sup>1</sup> *exiit* which would account both for it and the *exiet* of some inferior MSS. The hexameter of the distich ‘at si tardus eris, errabis; transiet aetas | quam cito! non segnis stat remeatque (-ue) dies,’ in addition to a rare and here a seemingly motiveless lengthening, presents a form of the future without warrant or parallel in classical Latin. But Lachmann sooner than accept the *transiit* of the ‘deteriores’ has thrust a solecism<sup>2</sup> upon Tibullus a hundred and fifty years at least before its time, and a solecism moreover which appears as a corruption in one of the passages *Aen.* 10. 785 [*transiit* PR, *transiet* (with *e* corrected to *i*) M] that he cites himself. Sommer’s acceptance of his predecessor’s error<sup>3</sup> may perhaps serve as an excuse for dealing with a reading and a form so generally discredited. The instances alleged by Neue-Wagener *Formenlehre* 3. 326 sq. have disappeared from our texts, and the *rediet* which Haupt foisted on Germanicus *Phaen.* 716 has gone the way of *exiet* in Seneca *Epist.* 17. 9, 113. 20, *Apoc.* 3. 1, of *iniet* in *Benef.* 2. 1. 2 and *transiet* in *N.Q.* 3. 10. 3.

As to the quantity of the perfect the facts are clear and easily stated. While in *abiit* and its like there is abundant evidence of the scansion  $\cup \cup -$  and none of the scansion  $\cup \cup \cup$ , in the case of *exiit* and its like there is none of the scansion  $\cup \cup -$  and plenty of the scansion  $\cup \cup \cup$ .

The anomaly which nonplussed L. Mueller ‘*huius usus satis mirifici*’ p. 399 is no longer a mystery. The so-called ‘law of iambic shortening’ which made *sciō* and *modō* from *sciō* and *modō* produced *ist* out of *iit* (Ter. *Phorm.* 706, Verg. *Aen.* 9. 418, Val. Fl. 6. 685). *abiit* stands in the same relation to *iit* as *ripūtō* does to *putō* or *ālibi* to *ibi* and *exiit* in the same relation to *iit* as *nesciō* does to *sciō* or *sciūbi* to *ūbi*.

A word in conclusion as to the *-i*. The perfect *it* (*ist*) has been discussed by Sommer *Handbuch* pp. 566 sq. and *Kritische Erläuterungen* p. 166. It seems clear that the *i* arises from a diphthong; and the Sanskrit perfect (1 sing.) *iy-āy-a*, quoted from Brugmann’s discussion, offers an instructive

<sup>1</sup> *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society*, vol. 3, p. 178 (1890).

<sup>2</sup> Pompeii *commentum artis Donati* (Gramm. Lat. V. 225 Keil) ‘*si autem i non habeat ante o sed s habeat, futurum tempus in -o mittit, exeo, exibo; exiam non dicimus; solocismus est.*’

<sup>3</sup> *Handbuch*, p. 537, ‘das entsprechende Futurum hat schon Tibull. I. 4. 27 einmal unter dem Zwang des Metrums gebildet.’ The ‘stress of metre’ then stopped Tibullus from using *transiit* in a hexameter; but Propertius (2. 11. 5) was presumably more fortunate.

parallel. The *ei* appears then to have been preserved in *redieit* C.I.L. I. 541 and Plautus *Merc.* 530 in the Ambrosianus, and *iit* will have come from *iieit*.<sup>1</sup>

### 3. *Anien* : *lien*, *rien*.

An undisputed rule of Classical Latin quantity is that a native word ending in *unaccented en* has the *e* of its ultimate short whatever the original quantity. Thus *flāmēn* masc. and neut., *pectēn* masc., in contrast to *attagēn* *ἀτταγήν*, *Sirēn*, *rēn*, *sp̄lēn*. To this rule *Anien* and *lien* alone are said to constitute exceptions.<sup>2</sup>

*Anien*, an old variant of *Aniō*<sup>3</sup> (a Latin name according to Conway *Italian Dialects* 334), is proved not only by the analogy of the other cases, but by the actual scansion in Statius *Silu.* i. 5. 25.

*lien*. Some four hundred years after the first appearance of *lien* in literature a long *en* is found in its stem. Serenus Sammonicus *Liber Medicinalis* 414 'nonnulli memorant consumi posse *liēnem*,' *ib.* 425 'dulcia Plautus ait grandi minus apta *liēni*;' the nominative which may be presumed to have the same quantity occurs in v. 402 'quando *lien* tumido circumligat ilia uinclo.' The earlier medical writer Celsus uses the word frequently, but there is no clue to its quantity unless his nominative *lienīs* (see below) be supposed to be such.

We must now go back to Plautus, the examples from whom I will now transcribe:

sed quid tibi est? CA. *lien* enicat, renes dolent

*Curc.* 236.

perii. seditionem facit *lien*, occupat praecordia

*Merc.* 124 (Iamb. Octonarius).

*lien* diirectust. PA. ambula, id *liēni* optimumst

*Curc.* 244.

nam iam quasi sona *liēne* cinctus ambulo

*Curc.* 220.

(the source of Sammonicus 402 *l.c.* above)

perii. cor *lienosum*, opinor, habeo. iam dudum salit

*Cas.* 414 (Troch. Septenarius).

Unfortunately we have lost the passage to which Sammonicus refers in 425.

<sup>1</sup> *ei* for later *i* is well attested in this for early Latin; cf. Lindsay *Latin Language* p. 456 and A. W. Hodgman *Classical Quarterly* I. p. 122, who says there are thirty-three instances in Plautus.

<sup>2</sup> The nominative of *Nerionem* given as the name of the wife of Mars, Gellius *Noct. Att.* 13. 23 (22) with the passages there cited, including Plaut. *Truc.* 515, is not known for certain, Gellius suggesting 'Nerio' or 'Nerienes.' But as the balance of authority is clearly in favour of the quantity *Nērionem* or *Nērionem*, not for the

*Nerionem* which a number of scholars adopt, the word does not in any case help us here.

<sup>3</sup> Its Latin origin is doubted by some on the ground that the inflexion -*ēnis* postulates an Ablaut without example in Indo-European, Sommer *op. cit.* p. 360 with the references given there. The original declension seems to have been *Aniō*, *Aniōnis*, but *Anien* is as old as Cato, and it is clear from the examples in the *Thesaurus* s.v. that both forms were in use. A later inflexion was *Aniō*, *Aniōnis* after the normal pattern of *legiō*, *legiōnis*.

Consonantization or absorption of the *i* in *lien* being out of the question, the word must in all these places be a disyllable, and careful consideration of them without respect to the later scansion of the word irresistibly suggests that in the time of Plautus the *e* of at least its stem and oblique cases was short: *liēni*, *liēne*, *liēnosum*.<sup>1</sup> It is possible that Martianus Capella, 3. 296, was aware of this quantity as, after speaking of 'masculina ut *flamen pecten*,' 'communia duobus generibus ut *tibicen fidicen*,' 'neutra ut *nomen flumen*,' he goes on 'altera species est generis masculini quae E litteram ante extremam N seruat ut *lien rien*, quae tamen ipsa quoque in ceteris ut superiora declinantur.' For if the quantity of the vowel is different, the only point of resemblance 'in ceteris' is the *n*.

If the stem *lien-* was short in the time of Plautus, it must have changed its quantity by the time of Sammonicus. Can we discern a reason for the change? I think we can. The close associations of *lienes* with *rēns* (cf. *Curc.* 236 supra) and of *lien* with *splēn* seem sufficient for the purpose. The existence of *rien*, a bye-form of *ren*, is particularly significant; see Festus p. 277a 'rienes antiqui uocabant nefrundines quia Graeci eos νεφροίς dicunt'; Plautus 'glaber erat tamquam *rien*.' And Charisius, *Gramm. Lat.* I. 28. 13 Keil and elsewhere, Marius Plotius Sacerdos, *ib.* VI. 474. 10 Probus *Catholica*, *ib.* IV. 9. 7, and Priscian II. 149. 7, all couple *lien* and *rien*.

To pass to the nominative, *liēn* in Plautus would involve less of a strain on the 'iambic shortening law' than *liēn*; and a *liēnis* in Celsus would have the countenance of *iūuēnis*<sup>2</sup> instead of the splendid isolation of *liēnis*.

*rien*. The quantity of the nominative singular *ren* may be considered established though it does not occur in literature; the plural *rēnes* has already been quoted from Plautus, and Horace has *rēnes* and Grattius *rēnibus*. For *rien*, *rienis* there is nothing so tangible. The indications both as regards its relations to *ren* and its correspondences to *lien* are ambiguous or conflicting; and the cognates of both words are unknown.<sup>3</sup>

Before we can complete our investigation, we must consider our two words in relation to other masculines with stems ending in *-n*, premising only that the appearance of *e* after *i* is due to the arresting force of dissimilation, such as we find in *pietas*, *uarietas* and so forth by the side of *castitas*, *cupiditas* and the like. The confusion of these stems in Latin, contrasting sharply with the distinctness of Greek (-ων, -ωπος; -ων, -οπος; -ην, -ηπος; -ην, -επος), is the result of two tendencies, the weakening of all unaccented vowels to *i* (*e* when *i* has

<sup>1</sup> With this would agree the Sanskrit *plīhan-* (*plīhan-*), the only one of its Indo-European congeners that stands very near to it.

<sup>2</sup> The stem of this word, as the gen. plur. *iunenum* (Ennius) and the cognates *iunem-tus*, *iunem-cus* indicate, was originally consonantal. The singular appears to be later than the plural, the nominative first appearing in Catullus, 64. 58 (Sommer *op. cit.* p. 370). The word and its relations to *senex*, *senis* have been discussed by Brugmann *Archiv* 15. pp. 1 sqq. He considers

that the *e* was preserved through its associations with *senex* (these are we may observe especially strong in the plural where *iunenes*, earlier *iuniores*, and *senes*, earlier *seniores*, is a standing military distinction). But inasmuch as *gi* and a nasal is not found in Latin except where the *i* is original as in *vincio*, *vincio*, neither *iunenis* nor *iunencus* stand in need of apology.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Walde *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* s.u. *ren*. He says 'Formell ist Kreuzung mit *Lien* zu erwägen.'

preceded) and the sweeping of an analogical  $\bar{o}$  through territory in which it had no original rights. *hemō* (*homō*), G. *hemōnis*, *homīnis* may serve as our example. Speaking broadly, the flexion redistributed itself on two lines, (a)  $\bar{o}$ ,  $\bar{o}nis$  after a vowel *legiō*, *legiōnis*, (b)  $\bar{o}$ ,  $\bar{o}nis$  after a consonant *ordō*, *ordīnis*; and the declension  $\bar{n}$ ,  $\bar{n}is$  all but disappeared. There remained however the following; *flāmen* (cf. Greek *ποι-μήν*), *pecten* (cf. *κτεῖς*, *κτενός*), *termen*, *turben*, and the compounds in  $\bar{c}en$  as *tibi-cen*. It is moreover not improbable that we should add, for an earlier period, *sanguen* (cf. *sanguinem*) and *inguen* (= Greek *ἰδῆν* m.), these having changed their gender through the attraction of *unguen* and the numerous other neuters in  $\bar{e}n$ . *termen* and *turben* have a special interest for us. *termen*, Varro L.L. 5. 21 (speaking of *terminus*) 'in Latio aliquot locis dicitur ut apud Accium, non "terminus" sed *termen*, hoc Graeci quod *τέρμωνα*, pote uel illinc. Euander enim qui uenit in Palatium e Graecia Arcas,' had a rival in *termo*, Festus p. 263 'termonem Ennius Graeca consuetudine dixit quem nos nunc terminum hoc modo "ingenti uadit cursu qua redditus *termo* est" et "hortatore bono prius quem finibus *termo*," a passage which has been curiously misunderstood. It does not show that Ennius used *termonem* for the accusative of *termo*, nor that Festus found this form in his works. *termonem* is the inflexion of Festus; and I imagine that by his 'hoc modo' the grammarian is guarding himself against the misapprehension that the accusative is anything more than the grammatical device by which words that in our non-inflexional writing would be placed between inverted commas are in Latin made to conform to the syntactical requirements of the sentence. Proof of this is surely not needed; but, as an example, 'uox uoluptatis' (Cicero) does not mean 'the voice of pleasure' but 'the word *pleasure*.' There is then nothing here against the hypothesis that Ennius inflected *termen terminis*, as he would inflect *flamen flaminis*. *terminus*, the predominant form, bears the same relation to the masculine *termen* as *glutinium* (Scaurus and Sallust) does to the neuter *gluten*. As to *turben* which has been preserved to Tibullus 1. 5. 3 'namque agor ut per plana *citus* sola uerbere *turben*' (MSS. *turbo*) by the witness of Charisius, I cannot understand why Professor Buck should call it, *Classical Philology* 12 (1917), p. 27 n. 4, a 'late and obviously secondary' formation. By the time of Tibullus  $\bar{o}$  had established itself as the masculine and feminine nominative and  $\bar{e}n$  as the neuter nominative for nouns whose genitive ended with  $\bar{o}nis$ . Why should a formation after an ordinary type of masculines have been remodelled on another that had almost become extinct? And if it was on the neuters that it was remodelled, why did it cling to its gender?

The doublet *pollis* and *pollen* we know from the grammarians, who had access to much that has now disappeared. It is clear, if only from the acc. *pollinem* (Cato Terence), that it was either a masculine or a feminine noun; and as some report it as feminine others as masculine and others again as neuter, cf. Priscian 6. 12. 66 (II. 250. 17 Keil) 'haec *pollis pollinis*<sup>1</sup> sic

<sup>1</sup> It is worth noting that according to Marius there were no Latin feminine substantives that Plotius Sacerdos (*Gramm. Lat.* V. 474. 25 Keil) ended in  $\bar{a}$ .

Charisius; Probus autem et Caesar<sup>1</sup> hoc pollen pollinis declinauerunt,' while Phocas says 'hic cinis cineris, hic pollis pollinis, hic pubis puberis,' *Gramm. Lat.* (Keil) V. 418. 10, it would seem that here too we have a masculine *-en* which has been attracted by the neuters in *-en*.

To the doublet *pollis pollen* the doublet *sanguis sanguen* appears to be a close parallel; and since the *i* of *sanguis* for *sanguin-s* was originally long, it is a plausible assumption that the *i* of *pollis* for *pollin-s* was long too. Taking these two words by themselves it would seem probable that when the ending *-en* had become predominately neuter and proportion required a masculine nominative for the accusatives *pollinem, sanguinem* a new one was formed by means of the suffix *s* while the old nominatives *pollen sanguen* went over to the neuters. In the case of *sanguis* still further irregularities were caused through its entanglement with *anguis*, which produced on the one side the shortened *sanguis* and the compound *exsanguis* and on the other side *anguen, anguineus*, this latter a later form for the correct *angu-inus*.

'Mais revenons à nos moutons.' It will not have escaped an attentive reader's notice that the words in the three foregoing groups have certain features in common. They all form exceptions to a well-known rule of Latin sound-lore, that final syllables closed by a consonant are short; and in all the penultimate vowel is *i*, and this *i* is followed by a long *e* or a diphthong whose first element is *e*. If the final syllable of *lien* and *rien* be *-ën*, there is no further bond in the group as a whole; but its remaining members show yet another similarity. They either constitute or conclude with an *anapaest*.

It is tempting to speak of a Law of the Anapaest. But at present I will refrain.

J. P. POSTGATE.

LIVERPOOL,  
June 13, 1917.

<sup>1</sup> In his treatise *De Analogia*.

## NOTES ON SENECA *EPISTVLAE MORALES*.

SENECA: *Epp. Mor.* 15 § 9 detraxi tibi non pusillum negotii: una mercedula et unum Graecum ad haec beneficia accedet: ecce insigne praeceptum. . .

*Unum Graecum*, as Professor Summers says (*Cl.Q.* II. 25), is impossible. In all probability *Graecum* is a gloss on a Greek word. Professor Tucker (*Cl.Q.* VII. 55) has proposed ἐπώνιον. It is true that Seneca does not hesitate to use Greek words which had become current among Romans; see Professor Summers's list on p. 4. of his *Select Letters of Seneca* and compare 95 § 65 'his adicit causarum inquisitionem, aetiologian quam quare nos dicere non audeamus, cum grammatici, custodes Latini sermonis, suo iure ita appellant, non uideo.' Still he never uses Greek words without necessity in the way that Cicero does in his letters to Atticus, and he even avoids so common a word as δόγμα on the ground that it has a Latin equivalent (54 § 1). It is therefore very unlikely that he would have used such a word as ἐπώνιον here. Before seeing Professor Tucker's emendation I had thought of *xenium*, and I still think this more probable ('suos rex reginae placet'). *Xenium*, at least in the plural, was in common use in the time of Martial and Pliny the Younger, and may very well have been a common colloquial word in Seneca's time.<sup>1</sup> As for *unum*, I take it that *una* was accidentally repeated by a copyist and assimilated to *xenium*. I would suggest therefore 'una mercedula et xenium ad haec beneficia accedet.' For the construction cf. 8 § 3 'et fera et piscis . . . decipitur. *Una*, which Professor Summers suspects (*Cl.Q.* II. 25), is perfectly sound. Seneca means that this time he will pay his debts by *one* quotation *only* (cf. 8 § 9 'unum uersum . . . referam'). Against Professor Summers's emendations it should be noted that *mercedula* must refer forward and not backward, for the metaphor of payment is not used of any benefit conferred by these letters on Lucilius, but only of the quotations, cf. 6 § 7 'quoniam diurnam tibi mercedulam debeo.' Like Professor Tucker, I suspect *idem qui supra*. I should conjecture that Seneca's answer contained the names of Epicurus and one of his friends and that this was a gloss on the friend's name, meaning that he is the same person who is mentioned in a previous epistle.

29 § 2 spargenda manus est.

Perhaps we should read 'spargenda manu semina. Cf. *De Ben.* 1. 1 § 2 'semina in solum effutum et sterile non spargimus.' If *-mina* were lost, *manu* *-se* would easily become *manus ē*.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Vitruv. 6. 7 § 4 'ideo pictores eas quae appellauerunt. mittebantur hospitibus picturis imitantes xenia



33 § 9 'multum' inquit 'uiua uox facit.' non quidem haec quae alienis uerbis commodatur et actuari uice fungitur.

According to Forcellini, K. E. Georges, Lewis and Short, and the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, *actuarius* here means a shorthand-writer, as in Suet. *Iul.* 55. Forcellini explains the passage thus: 'h. e. tantummodo ab aliis dicta profert, nihil de suo addit: quemadmodum actarius scribit ab aliis dictata.' But this would not be a very apt illustration of 'haec <uiua uox> quae. . .'. The true explanation is suggested by Forcellini's general account of the word. *Actarius*, he says, is 'ὑπομνηματογράφος, . . . qui acta perscribit.' The clerk who took down the proceedings of the Senate (*acta senatus*) would doubtless also be called on to read them, as with us the secretary who takes the minutes at one meeting reads them at the next. Hence *actuarius* = *is qui acta recitat*. Cf. *Iuu.* 7. 104 'quis dabit historico quantum daret *acta legenti*?' The scholium there is 'quantum datur exceptori' (i.e. to a shorthand-writer, cf. Suet. *Iul.* 55 'ab actuariis *exceptam* [sc. orationem] male subsequentibus uerba dicentis'). Friedländer says this explanation is wrong, and, like Mr. Duff, thinks Juvenal means the slave who read the *acta diurna* to his master. Mayor says he means 'the *actuarius* who copied out the *acta* <*diurna*> and read them aloud to amuse the company at table.' But why should a man give anything to his own slave for doing his ordinary work? The scholium may very well be correct; if so, Juvenal is referring to the clerks of the Senate. But *daret* is still a difficulty, and one may perhaps conjecture, following the scholium, that Juvenal wrote 'quantum *datur* *acta legenti* ("who will pay a historian a sum equal to the salary of the clerk who reads the minutes in the Senate?")'. For our purpose the decisive passage is Petronius 53 'actuarius, qui tamquam urbis *acta* recitauit.' *Actarius* then means here and in Petronius one who reads *acta*, whether, as in Petronius, a slave so called because he read the *acta diurna* to his master,<sup>1</sup> or the Clerk of the House, who took down the proceedings of the Senate (*acta senatus*) and read the minutes at the next meeting. Lewis and Short derive the word from the noun *actus*; and the *Thesaurus* derives *actuarius* in all senses from *actus*; but as used in Petronius, Seneca, and Suetonius, *ll. cc.*, it is obviously derived from *act-a*, like *not-arius* from *not-ae*, *libr-arius* from *libr-i*, *tabell-arius* from *tabell-ae*. Hence one would expect *actarius*, the form found in glossaries and inscriptions. The form *actuarius*, though found in manuscripts at the places cited, must be a barbarism, and could hardly have been used by Seneca. Nettleship, *Contributions to Latin Lexicography*, s.v. *actarius*, says: 'Velius Longus, p. 74, says a distinction was drawn between *actarius* and *actuarius*: *actarius* being *scriptor actorum*, *actuarius* *qui actum agit* or (p. 155) *qui diuersis actibus occupatur*,' and s.v. *actuarius* he says: '*Actarius* is given as = *actarius* (q.v.) by the MSS. of Petron. 53. 1; Sen. *Ep.* 33.9; Suet. *Iul.* 55: but the distinction quoted by Velius Longus seems to be correct.' We

<sup>1</sup> K. E. Georges's explanation—'ein Rech. Short's 'one who writes out accounts' are also-  
nungsführer, Buchhalter'—and Lewis and gether erroneous.

should therefore read *actarius* in Seneca, Petronius, and Suetonius, *ll. cc.*, in spite of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*.

40 § 1. si imagines nobis amicorum absentium iucundae sunt, quae memoriam renouant et desiderium absentiae falso atque inani solacio leuant.

Delete *absentiae*. *absentium iucundae* in the line before became *absentiae iucundae* in some copy, just as in this line *p* has *desideriae absentiae*. This *absentiae* was written as a marginal variant in the archetype of *p* and *L* and thence inserted in the wrong place.

40 § 2. solet magno cursu uerba conuellere, quae non effundit ima (una *codd. dett.*), sed premit ut arguet. plura enim ueniunt quam quibus uox una sufficiat.

Delete *ima*; it probably originated as a variant of *una* in the next line and, like *absentiae* above, was inserted in the wrong place. Or it may have been an unconscious anticipation of *una* by a copyist, like the first *quidem* in 41 § 5, . . . ut propius [quidem] diuina nossemus, conuersatur quidem nobiscum. . . . Professor Summers's conjecture *unda* cannot be right. It is not required either as subject or as instrumental ablative.

40 § 9. et ipse malueris, si necesse est, uel P. Vinicius dicere. qui itaque? cum quaereretur quomodo P. Vinicius diceret, Asellius ait 'tractim.'

Professor Summers (*Cl.Q.* II. 28) objects to *qui itaque* (1) that it is unnecessary, (2) that the interrogative adverb *qui* does not occur elsewhere in Seneca. With regard to (1) something is required to connect the sentences, for *cum quaereretur* alone would not do this. In 29 § 6 'de cuius secta cum quaereretur, Scaurus ait . . .,' which he quotes, there is the relative *cuius* to connect the sentences. His emendation assumes a large number of separate corruptions and leaves an awkward asyndeton. But *qui itaque?* is very strange, for *itaque* could hardly have a meaning in such a question. I would suggest that something has been lost through homoeoteleuton, e.g. 'et ipse malueris, si necesse est, ut P. Vinicius dicere, *qui ita lentus erat ut uolgo mirarentur posse quemquam tam tarde loqui*. itaque, cum. . . .'

40 § 10. 'dic, numquam dicas?'

Professor Summers's conjecture would, I think, require '*hoc numquam a me audias*.' Professor Tucker's 'dic, numquid manducas?' is far more probable. One might also suggest 'dic, numquid dictas?' ('I say, are you dictating something?') For the indicative see Roby § 1761 and Gildersleeve and Lodge § 467 note.

42 § 4. eadem uelle subaudis (*in fine uersus*) cognosces: da posse, quantum uolunt *p* (si sub auditis cognoscis *L*).

Buecheler's emendation—'eadem uelle, si iuuat audentis, cognosces'—is very remote from the MSS. and does not account for the corruption; also it

makes 'da posse, quantum uolunt' otiose. *Subaudis* and *si sub auditis* must be corruptions of an interlinear gloss *subaudi si* on *cognosces* or else on *da*, i.e. 'da posse is equivalent to *si dabis posse*.' If we delete *subaudis*, the sentence will be perfectly grammatical; but the *da*-clause should come first, for in this equivalent for a conditional sentence the imperative always precedes the future indicative. Read therefore 'da posse, quantum uolunt: eadem uelle cognosces.' [In Th. de Juges's variorum edition, Orleans, 1628, 'eadem uelle eos cognosces: da posse, quantum uolunt' is printed with no note or mention of any variant reading.]

47 § 10. Variana clade.

In his note on this passage Professor Summers says: 'We do not, I think, hear elsewhere of any of the prisoners having been spared.' He has forgotten Tacitus *Ann.* 1. 61 § 6 'et cladis eius superstites, pugnam aut uincula elapsi' and 12. 27 § 4 'aucta laetitia quod quosdam e clade Variana quadagesimum post annum seruitio exemerant.'

76 § 5. perge, Lucili, et propera, tibi nec tibi accidat quod mihi, ut senex discas. immo ideo magis propera, quoniam id non aggressus es quod perdiscere uix senex possis.

The simplest correction of *tibi nec tibi* is to delete the first *tibi*, regarding it as a copyist's accidental anticipation. *Propera, nec tibi accidat* . . . will mean 'hasten, and do not let it be your fate, as it is mine, to go to school in your old age.' *Nec* is normal when a negative jussive subjunctive is added to an imperative (see Kühner<sup>2</sup>, II. 1. 192-3).

*Non* is obviously wrong, but it seems very unlikely that *negotium* would have become *non*, as Professor Summers supposes. More probably *non* has got into the text from a marginal 'N' = *nota*, i.e. an N.B. calling attention to the sentiment. (Compare Seneca's own practice, 6 § 5 'mittam itaque ipsos tibi libros et . . . imponam notas, ut ad ipsa protinus, quae probo et miror accedas.') In 71 § 19 *non* (ñ V) is also wrongly inserted in the MSS.

78 § 21. si nihil exorauerit.

An odd use of *exoro*. One would expect *exoraueris*.

80 § 1. licebit uno uadere.

The meaning evidently is that he will be able to go on with his thinking uninterruptedly. Professor Summers is undoubtedly right in holding that a noun has been lost after *uno*, but his *actu* seems an unlikely word. Professor Tucker proposed *tono*. But *tonus* does not occur in any sense that will suit the context. *Tenore* seems to be the word required. Cf. *de Otio* 1 § 1 'tunc potest uita aequali et uno tenore procedere.'

82 § 24. magnis telis magna portenta feriuntur. serpentem illam in Africa saeuam et Romanis legionibus bello ipso terribiliorem frustra sagittis fundisque

petierunt. ne pythio quidem vulnerabilis erat, cum ingens magnitudo pro uastitate corporis solida ferrum et quicquid humanae torserant manus reiceret: molaribus demum fracta saxis est.

*pythio* V *pythyo* P *pilo* uel *pilis* Erasmus.

The readings of VP point to *pythio*. This cannot be right, for (1) the word does not occur elsewhere as a name of an engine of war, (2) 'quicquid humanae torserant manus' would be more appropriate of weapons thrown by hand than of missiles hurled from a *ballista*, (3) there is an ascending order—(i.) 'sagittis fundisque,' (ii.) 'pythio,' (iii.) 'molaribus saxis.' If *pythio* = *ballista*, as Buecheler suggested, this ascending scale is destroyed and the climax *molaribus saxis* anticipated, for the *ballista* hurled stones, sometimes a hundred pounds in weight. Now when the arrows and sling-stones of the light infantry had no effect, what would be the next weapon tried?—The *pilum* of the legionaries. Then we get (i.) arrows and sling-stones, (ii.) iron-pointed javelins thrown by hand, cf. 'ferrum et quicquid humanae torserant manus,' (iii.) big stones hurled by a *ballista*. Therefore Erasmus's *pilis* should be adopted. The plural is required to match the other plurals. The corruption *pythio* probably arose from some marginal note about the Python slain by Apollo at Delphi. [I find that Lipsius defended *pilo* by the argument 'crescit oratio.']

86 § 10. sed, di boni, quam iuuat illa balinea intrare obscura et gregali tectorio inducta, quae scires Catonem tibi aedilem aut Fabium Maximum aut ex Corneliis aliquem manu sua temperasse!

The combination of tenses in 'quam iuuat . . . quae scires . . .' is impossible, for it is nonsense to say 'quam iuuat illa balinea intrare, quae scires Catonem tibi . . . temperasse.' Read *quam iuuaret* . . . ('What a pleasure it would have been to enter a bath which you knew . . .').

87 § 9. hic, qui inter illos apparatus delicatos cum maxime dubitat utrum se ad gladium locet an ad cultrum.

*Gladium* is of course the gladiator's sword, cf. Cic. *pro Sex. Roscio* § 118 'num aut ille lanista omnino iam a gladio recessisse uidetur? . . .' Of *cultrum* two explanations have been offered: (1) The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, s.v. *culter*, has 'culter . . . i. q. pugio uel gladius brevis. . . . SEN. *Contr.* exc. 6, 5 quidam Thracum cultris armati. SEN. *Epist.* 87, 9 dubitat, utrum se ad gladium locet an ad cultrum (i. ad officium gladiatoris, cf. SCRIB. LARG. 13 occidi hinnulum cultro, quo gladiator iugulatus sit). . . .' It is not clear how the writer proposes to distinguish between *ad gladium* and *ad cultrum*. If he thinks *ad gladium* means 'to serve as a soldier' and *ad cultrum* 'to fight as a gladiator,' he is clearly wrong, for, apart from other considerations, there is no evidence that *culter* was a technical name for any gladiatorial weapon. If he thinks *ad cultrum* means 'to fight as a *Thraex*,' he is equally mistaken. In Sen. *Rhet. l.c.* the MSS. have 'Thracum cultu'; *cultris* is only a suggestion of A. Kiessling. *Thracum* there means natives of

Thrace. Moreover, the offensive weapon of the *Thraex* was the *sica*, see Daremberg and Saglio, s.v. *gladiator*, II. 1587, Friedländer, *SG.* II<sup>8</sup>. 539, cf. Mart. 3. 16. 2. The writer of the article in the *Thesaurus* must have been unusually careless, for he gives Varro *R.R.* 2. 5. 11 'paulo uerbosius haec, qui Manilii actiones secuntur lanii, qui ad cultrum bouem emunt: qui ad altaria, hostiae sanitatem non solent stipulari' (he does not quote the passage in full) as an instance of *culter* in the sense of a sacrificial knife, though the antithesis of *ad cultrum* and *ad altaria* shows that it must mean a butcher's knife (see Daremberg and Saglio, s.v. *culter*, I. 1585). (2) Muretus, Lipsius, Daremberg and Saglio, s.v. *culter*, I. 1586, Friedländer, *SG.* II<sup>8</sup>. 393-4, 544-5, and Professor Summers take *cultrum* to be the hunting-knife used in the *uenationes*, cf. Mart. 4. 35. 4 'stupuitque superbus | uenator cultro nil superesse suo.' *Culter* is used of so many different kinds of knives that its precise meaning can be determined only by the context. Here *se ad gladium locet* at once turns our thoughts to the *harena* and hence serves to limit *cultrum* to the weapon of the *uenator*. Also it is known that men did hire themselves out as *uenatores*, see Friedländer's quotation from Ulpian: 'et qui operas suas ut cum bestiis depugnaret locauerit.' Hence there can be little doubt that by *cultrum* is meant the *culter uenatorius*.

§§ 9 doces me quomodo inter se acutae ac graues <uoces> consonent . . . fac potius quomodo animus secum meus consonet. . .

I do not see how *fac quomodo* is to be translated. 'Cause my soul to be harmonious' would be 'fac potius *ut*. . .' Moreover, the antitheses which follow in §§ 9-11 show that the antithesis should be between what is taught and what should be taught. 'Fac potius <discam> quomodo . . .' or 'fac potius <doceas> quomodo . . .' seems to be necessary.

R. L. DUNBABIN.

UNIVERSITY OF TASMANIA,  
AUSTRALIA.

## THE AFFATIM GLOSSARY AND OTHERS.

THE bilingual Philoxenus Glossary drew some of its materials from Festus de Signif. Verb. and occasionally mentions his name. Its Festus glosses have been collected in a Jena dissertation by Dammann. The Abolita Glossary (if we may so term the collection enclosed within square brackets in *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* IV. pp. 4-198) seems to have begun (in its original arrangement) with Festus excerpts. Before we can glean from these two glossaries every available scrap of evidence about Festus, we must try to complete and correct them. For of the Philoxenus Glossary (Philox.) we have practically only one MS., and that of the ninth century. It must have omitted many items and perverted the words of many others. The Abolita Glossary (Abol.) was associated (but not mixed up) with another, the Abstrusa Glossary (Abstr.), in Spain, and this composite collection (Abstr.-Abol.) passed into Italy. The MSS. are, we may say, only two, and of each a certain number of leaves are missing. The older and better MS. (*Vat.*), an uncial codex of the eighth century, was written apparently in Central Italy; the other (*Cass.*) was written two centuries later at Monte Cassino. They show us Abol. not in its original form, but rearranged in a not too strict alphabetical order (between AB- and ABC-). The St. Gall Glossary was compiled from (1) Philox., (2) the composite Abstr.-Abol., and supplies some of those Festus glosses of Philox. and Abol. which are omitted in our MSS. It seems to have been a Bobbio compilation (but see below). Our best MS. was written in rude uncials at St. Gall in the eighth century.

This St. Gall Glossary (Sangall.) is of a type which prevailed from the Carolingian Revival of Learning, the extract-glossary; for it offers us not Philox. and Abstr.-Abol. fully transcribed, but merely selections from the pair. The compiler selects now an item from one, now an item from the other, and often blends his two authorities into a composite item or re-casts the words of the one to suit the words of the other. It is a practice which is easily explained, especially in the earlier Carolingian period. A glossary was a book indispensable at a monastery. It could not be lent to another cloister, at least not for any long time. In most cases a visitor would be the transcriber, and the amount he transcribed would depend on the length of his visit. The result of this practice has been to obscure the history of gloss-tradition. We find many glossaries which resemble each other more or less, but we cannot say which collection is derived from which, or how precisely they are related to a

common ancestor. The nucleus seems the same or at least similar, but the rest, the wrappings, different.

The nucleus common to most of the glossaries in Vol. IV. of the *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* (and to many in Vol. V.) is clearly Abstr., and in none more clearly than the glossary with which this article begins, the Affatim Glossary (Aff.). In pp. 471-581 Goetz provides an apograph of a Leyden MS. (67 F) written somewhere in the north of the Frankish Empire in Charlemagne's time, and an apparatus of the variant readings in other MSS. from the same archetype, the oldest of which is a Ghent codex of Charlemagne's time, now at Leyden (Voss. Fol. 26).

At first sight Aff. seems to be nothing more than a compilation from Abstr., the Abstr. items being re-arranged to suit the arrangement in Aff., which is more advanced in alphabetical precision than the order followed in Goetz' MSS. of Abstr. (see Loewe's *Prodr.*, p. 107, for details). I need not illustrate the connexion between the two. It is patent on every page, except on pp. 524 sqq. (of *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* IV.) where there is a marked break after the *hi*-glosses (see the HI-section of Abstr. on pp. 86-87 of the same volume). Clear traces of compilation from Abstr. do not reappear until certain *in*-glosses (corresponding to some in the IN-section of Abstr., on p. 98). The break was due to the loss of four leaves of an exemplar, a loss duly recorded by the compiler of Aff.: *Hic habet minus* (i.e. 'deest,' or rather 'desunt') *inter H et I folia quattuor quae excisa fuerunt de exemplari* (524, 45-46). Deprived of Abstr. for this portion, the compiler has given us a clearer view than we get elsewhere of his other source (or sources). We find batches of Virgil glosses which often retain their original order, the order of the words' occurrence in the text of Virgil: e.g. (p. 525) No. 41 *Infandum* (*Aen.* 1, 251); No. 42 *Impar* (*Aen.* 1, 475); No. 43 *Iamdudum* (? *Aen.* 1, 580); No. 44 *In arce* (*Aen.* 3, 531); No. 45 *Infabricata* (*Aen.* 4, 400); No. 46 *Iam uertitur* (*Aen.* 5, 626); No. 47 *Iam ualidum minus* (? *Aen.* 5, 716); No. 48 *Imago* (? *Aen.* 6, 695); and so on (cf. 527, 15 sqq.; 528, 39 sqq.; 530, 60 sqq.; 531, 21 sqq.). And we find many Abolita glosses.

Now a clue to the source of these non-Abstrusa items is furnished by an error of the archetype in the *ca*-words, the fusion of the two glosses *Catax* and *Consentaneum* (491, 35 *Catax*: *claudus a coxa*, *Consentaneum*: <conueniens, aptum>). Both are Abolita glosses. On foll. 119-128 of Leyden 67 F is a fragmentary transcript (A-F) of a glossary which must be a representative of the source we are seeking; for in it the gloss *Catax* is immediately followed by the gloss *Consentaneum*. From the details furnished by Loewe (*Prodr.* p. 171) we see that it consisted of Virgil glosses taken directly from the marginalia of a Virgil text (for Loewe mentions their use of *hic* 'in this passage') and of Abolita glosses. Where did these last come from? Must we infer that the (North Frankish?) compiler of this composite Virg.-Abol. collection (or at least of the Abolita portion of it) drew from a pure Abol. MS., in which Abol. was not associated with Abstr.? The inference is not unnatural, but cannot be called



necessary. Pure Abstr. MSS. were common. In the composite Abstr.-Abol. MSS. of the early period the two constituents would be marked off. It would be easy for a compiler, whose monastery-library already contained a pure Abstr. MS., to limit his selection to the Abol. items.

Whether incorporated with Abstr. or not, so early a record of Abol. items must be a useful check on the imperfections of *Vat.* Here is a list of some items of Aff. which might make a claim to be Festus glosses (or on Early Latin words). Those found in *Vat.* or Sangall. and, of course, those known to be Abstrusa items (for there is no evidence that Abstr. drew from Festus) are omitted:

1. (471, 27) Atta: qui primis plantis ambulat. This looks like Philox. (378, 46 of *Corp. Gloss. Lat. II.*) Atta: ὁ ἀκροῖς τοῖς δακτύλοις ἐπιβαλὼν (on this and the following Philox. glosses see Dammann). 2. (472, 10) Anatum (*leg.* Anctum?): miserum (*leg.* Anatem: miseriam?). 3. (472, 35) Applare: cocla (*leg.* cochlear? cotula?). There is a Philox. gloss (18, 32) Appia (*leg.* Applar?): εἶδος σκεύους, ὡς Πακούβιος. 4. (472, 37) Abstatata: navis piratica. Cf. Philox. 188, 50 Stlata: πειρατικῆς σκάφους εἶδος. But there is rather a suggestion of Caper (*Gram. Lat. VII.* 107, 1) Stlataris sine C littera dicendum ab stlata naue piratica. And this intrudes a suspicion of the gloss Applare, whether it is not a mere wrong-headed transference from some grammarian's list of nouns in -are: applare, cochleare, etc. 5. (480, 38) Acinari (*leg.* Ag-?) tricari in paruo morari (a kindred glossary omits 'in paruo'). 6. (480, 50) Anticipassit: ante coeperit (cep-) uel prius prehenderit (found also, with the addition of 'ante fecerit', in the AA glossary, a South Italian compilation which made use of a good MS. of Abstr.-Abol. and has preserved many of the Festus glosses of Abol. omitted by *Vat.*) 7. (481, 22) Antiae: capilli a(n)te missi (? with a glossary's characteristic use of capricious suspension, on which see my *Notae Latinae*, p. 416. Goetz prints 'amissi'). 8. (481, 39) Armilustrum: quod armis locus lustretur. 9. (482, 14) Ancti: excruciat. 10. (485, 49) Actus: spatium agri CXX. pedes. 11. (485, 52) Augur: qui per auspicia diuinabat. 12. (486, 26) Amussis: regula fabri ae<qualis> qua tabulae diriguntur (the correction is supplied by a kindred glossary). 13. (486, 27) Auentibus: aud[i]entibus. There is an Abolita gloss (23, 29) Auentes: cupientes uel gaudentes. It suits Paul. 13, 17 Auere nihil aliud est quam cupere . . . cum significet et gaudere. The Affatim gloss suggests the (doubtful) emendation in Abol. 'audentes' and in Paul. 'audere.' 14. (487, 36-37) Bardus: hebes, stultus, ineptus, Bardus: carminum conditor. 15. (488, 11) Bacario: urceoli genus (Bec- in Aff., Bag- in a kindred glossary, etc.) There is another gloss (487, 41) Bacarium: uas aquarium. There seems to have been a Sangall. gloss combining the two (IV. 585, 24). 16. (488, 12) Blenni: taetri. A kindred glossary offers as the interpretation 'putidi, taetri.' There is an Abstrusa gloss (25, 3) Blennones: putidi, hircosi. 17. (489, 8) Bidental: locus [bis] de caelo tactus (a kindred glossary omits 'bis'). 18. (489, 28) Boues lucas: elephantes (-tos); quorum stridor barritus dicitur. Combining this with

Sangall. 212, 38, we get a hint that Festus in the lemma *Barrire* (Paul. 27) mentioned this old name of the elephant. 19. (494, 35) *Clepere*: *deripere* (subr-), *furare*. This is probably the *Abolita* gloss (33, 23) *Clepit*: *subripit*. 20. (496, 25) *Comitiare*: *loqui in conuentu*. 21. (497, 2) *Contio*: *conuentus populi uel conuocatio*. Cf. Paul. 58 *Contio*, *conuentus*; *dicta quasi conuocatio* (by which Paulus would mean 'like *conuentus* but with the same suffix as *conuocatio*'). There is one *Abstrusa* gloss (35, 35) *Contio*: *conuocatio populi*; another (44, 5) *Contio*: *populi multitudo*. Sangall. offers (222, 9) *Contio*: *conuentus populi*. But the kindred glossary already mentioned has *Contio*: *conuentio populi uel [ecclesia] conuentum (-tus)*. What Festus wrote was presumably: *quasi conuentio*. 22. (498, 4) *Clopeum* (COP-): *ornamentum*. This has been connected with Paul. 85 (*Galbeum*, *ornamenti genus*) on the strength of the reading (misreading?) 'culpeum' in a glossary *Vat. lat.* 1468, written in S. E. Italy or Dalmatia as late as the eleventh century (see Loew, *Beneventan Script*, p. 152, p. 362). The connexion is doubtful. The *Glossae Nominum*, which drew from a fuller version of Philox., has (572, 18 of Vol. II.) *Calbis*: *merces militi pro uirtute data* (cf. Philox. 95, 43 *Calbea*: *κόσμος*). 23. (502, 4) *Di aquili*: *manes inuidi (leg. inferi)*. The correct reading appears in the kindred glossary. 24. (502, 7) *Dapsile*: *copiose*. The kindred glossary adds 'abunde'. 25. (508, 24) *Duit*: *tribuit* <uel det>. The supplement comes from the kindred glossary; but the famous glossary of Corpus College, Cambridge (which offers *Duit*: *det, tribuit*), enables us to restore the true form, *Duit*: *det, tribuat* (the error having arisen from that common 'causa erroris' in glossaries, a capricious suspension, *tribū* for 'tribuat'). It may, with (508, 26) *Duent*: *dent, tribuat (leg. Duint)*, be a Terence gloss of *Abolita* omitted in our MSS. And (508, 25) *Duunt*: *dant, tribuunt (leg. Danunt)* is that Festus (?) gloss of *Abol.* which appears in our MSS. as (58, 53) *Dunt*: *dant, tribuunt*. 26. (508, 46 and 49) *Examussim*: *diligenter aut ex toto*, *Examussim*: *absolute siue certe*. The kindred glossary has *Examussim*: *absolute siue certe uel exquisite*. There is an *Abstrusa* gloss (70, 4) *Examussim*: *ex toto*. 27. (516, 22) *Facessit*: *facit uel recedit*. 28. (518, 57) *Fritinnunt*: *cantant*. 29. (519, 12) *Fiscella*: *forma ubi casei exprimuntur*. 30. (522, 24) *Gaesum*: *hasta uel gladius*. In the kindred glossary is the truer form, *Gaesum*: *hasta uel iaculum Gallice*. It may be a Virgil gloss. 31. (524, 30) *Hippitare*: *oscitare, bataclare* (French *bailler*, Italian *sbadigliare*). 32. (529, 32) *Inpolitus*: *inputatus*. The Sangall. gloss (246, 40) *Inpolitus*: *ineruditus* may be the *Abstrusa* item (96, 43) *Inpolitus*: *inperitus aut aspere inconpositus*. 33. (529, 48) *Inprolis*: *nondum uir*. Cf. Victorinus (*Gram. Lat.* VI, 20, 9): *qui nondum uir est*. 34. (530, 1) *Inpos*: *non potens animi*. 35. (535, 45) *Lurcones*: *audi deuatorores*. Cf. Nonius 10, 27 *lurcare est cum auditate cibum sumere*. 36. (539, 31) *Murrina*: *potio diuina, quae a Graecis nectar dicitur, de uino murrato ('id est uinum murratum' AA Glossary)*. We have a mere stump of this in Sangall. (257, 33) *Murrina*: *potio diuina*. 37. (551, 3) *Petulcum*: *cornipeta uel petulans insiliendo sicut capra*. 38. (557, 48-49) *Procapis*:

proximus, Procapibus: proximis. 39. (557, 57) Polita: ornata. 40. (558, 58) Quadrantale: amphora. 41. (572, 43) Taureae plagae: nerui geni(talis). If that is the true form, it suggests Lucilius. 42. (575, 56) Tu[n]ditantes: uerberantes, saepius tundentes. 43. (578, 19) Vesperugo: stella uesperae. 44. (578, 24-25) Vescus: saturatus, cibos non appetens, Vescis: saturatis. The second may or may not be merely another attempt to transcribe the exemplar. 45. (516, 32 and 578, 40, two botanical glosses) Framen: herba unde fraua (*leg. fraga?*) nascuntur, Vemarum: herba. The full form of the second appears in the AA Glossary, Vemarum: herbae genus quod in locis humidis nascitur. 46. (498, 26) Colustrum: lac concretum in mammis.

The last should have come after the twenty-second item in our list, but has been reserved as a stepping-stone to the glossary which we have now to consider, the one so often referred to as 'a kindred glossary.' It is printed by Goetz in Vol. V. (pp. 259-337) from a ninth-century MS. in the Amplonian collection at Erfurt (Amplon. Fol. 42), and is called by him the 'second Amplonian Glossary' (Ampl. II.). It brings us into touch with England, for it contains many Anglo-Saxon words, e.g. (330, 50) Sambuca: lignum, *elle* Saxonice. Now it may appear strange that only Festus, and not Nonius, figures in most of these glossaries. But the one and only archetype of Nonius seems to have belonged to an English monastery, and the *Compendiosa Doctrina* may have been unknown on the Continent until Alcuin came to Tours. So we could not expect to find a Nonius gloss till we reached the 'Franco-Saxon' region, the littoral opposite England. The last gloss in our list echoes exactly Nonius 84, 7 Colustra, lac concretum in mammis. It is a gloss shared by Ampl. II. And the fusion of the glosses Catax and Consentaneum, which gave us a clue to the source of the Festus glosses of Aff., becomes intelligible from Ampl. II. which offers Coltax instead of Catax, thus relegating the gloss to the CO-section and making it a possible neighbour of Consentaneum. A palaeographer can make a guess at the 'causa erroris,' an Insular (i.e. English, Irish, etc.) variety of *a* known as 'high-backed *a*,' which might be mistaken for *ol* (more often for *d*). The MS. of Abstrusa used by 'Ansileubus' (so we are wont to name the compiler of the Liber Glossarum) had the same misreading Coltax. The two (four?) earliest MSS. of his compilation belong to Northern France and use abbreviation-symbols of the English type. Since Placidus (with the pseudo-Placidus) was one of his sources, we may expect to find in Ampl. II. traces of ps.-Plac. as well as of Nonius.

Ampl. II. describes itself as a composite of two (or five) glossaries: II. (V. ? hardly 'secunda') Conscriptio Glossarum (i.e. glossariorum) In Vnam, quibus uerba quoque et nomina alia mixtim uel Latina uel Saxoniae inseruntur. What the constituents were is a question alien to this article, whose chief concern is with Festus glosses; and the new Festus glosses which Ampl. II. contributes (presumably from an old MS. of the composite Abstr.-Abol. in Insular script) are few. But Goetz' *Thesaurus Glossarum*, which emends and arranges the contents of his *Corpus Glossariorum*, provides promising material

for disentangling the skein; and anyone who will undertake the investigation will find much to interest him. From four glosses (272, 10; 272, 17; 272, 19; 279, 22) we can reconstruct an archetype like this:

Brumalia [suos bracos habet

Brumaria: rosina pluua

Bracata Gallia: Gallia quae incolat

Comata Gallia:<sup>1</sup> quae comatos habet.

Brumalia, the suprascript correction of the miswriting 'Brumaria,' was followed by the 'overflow' of the gloss Bracata Gallia (misspelt -lea). The overflow was not detected by the compiler of Sangall. (594, 16 Bracata: gallea, galeata) and (the archetype of) Leyden 67 E (692, 47? Bracata Galliaque incola situs est). Both try conjectural 'emendation.' A Festus gloss (possibly transmitted through Philox.) in which Ampl. II. again reveals the archetype's form is, I think, the gloss Agea, with the interpretation (263, 51) *uta gyrum nauis*. The first word is clearly *uia*; the second, if it is a noun in apposition, means 'the circuit': the whole implies that our compiler visualized Ennius' word as a way round by the bulwarks, not down the centre of the ship. Another compiler emended *uta* to *unda*, and thought of the wash of the ship (*Corp. Gloss. Lat.* IV. 479, 26 *recurrens unda*). Another discovered the right reading *uia* but thought of the way of the ship through the waters (V. 490, 44; 520, 9; 560, 30 *uia nauis in aqua dextra laeuaque*). The importance of Ampl. II. for the reconstruction of glossary-archetypes is clear. And anyone who will undertake to collect the Virgil glosses mentioned above will get much help from it, since it often preserves the Virgil batches in more or less coherence: e.g. (262, 68—263, 2) *Aestate noua: uerno tempore* (*Aen.* I, 430); *Aestus: uaporis calor* (*Aen.* 2, 759); <Aethiopes: homines nigri (cf. 291, 6), unde> *Aethiopium: nigrum, Aethon: tertius equus Solis* (*Aen.* 4, 481); *Aequatae: planatae* (*Aen.* 5, 844); *Aegida: scutum Mineruae* (*Aen.* 8, 354 or 435); *Aetherium sensum: caelestem spiritum* (*Aen.* 6, 747). Correct the error of Thes. Gloss. s.v. *Aequo* (and of the Latin Thesaurus I. col. 1022, l. 47).

In continuing, with the help of Ampl. II., our list of possible Festus glosses we are in danger of including some that stand twice removed from Abol. (or Philox.), glosses on the words of a writer like Aldhelm, who made a practice of culling strange words from glossaries and inserting them in his writings, e.g. 'circili' in *Epist. Eahfrid.* col. 93 Mig., culled from the Abstrusa gloss (33, 3) *Cercilius: naucula* (possibly a transcriber's mistake for *Cercurus*, which, according to Nonius 533, meant 'nauis pergrandis'). The continuation may begin with the just-mentioned gloss Agea: 47. (263, 51) *Agea: uia gyrum (gyrus?, gyro?, in gyrum?) nauis*. 48. (260, 8) *Abarcet: prohibet*. 49. (262, 8) *Adescit: aderit*. By a lucky accident we can prove that this item does not

<sup>1</sup> With this geographical gloss may be compared another, probably from the same collection, (333, 50) *Spania Citerior: adhuc et ad nos*;

Ulterior: longe nobis. The compiler was not a Spaniard nor an Italian. On the third of the Gallia trio, *Togata Gallia*, see Thes. Gloss.

come through Philox. For the compiler of Philox., mistaking the *aderet* of his source (Festus ?) for *adhaeret*, made his gloss (6, 35) *Adescit: κολλᾶται* (!). 50. (262, 8 and 20-21) *Ador: genus farris*, *Ador: farris genus*, *Adoreis: uictoriis*. Philox. cites Festus (8, 21) *Ador: νίκη, ὡς Πομπήριος*. (Cf. Paul. 3 *Ador, farris genus, etc.* *Adoriam laudem siue gloriam dicebant, etc.*). Nonius has (52, 14) *Ador, frumenti genus . . . unde et adorare, etc.* The Nonius Glossary, published in *Corp. Gloss.* V. 637 sqq. from a Leyden MS. of Charlemagne's time, has (649, 14) *Ador: frumentum, ab <ad>orando uocatum*. A marginal gloss on a passage of Phocas' Grammar (*Gram. Lat.* V. 416, 9), where the word *ador* occurs in a list of nouns ending in -or, offered *Ador: genus frumenti*. This marginal gloss, taken from Nonius, became an item in another Leyden Glossary of Charlemagne's time compiled from marginalia of certain books (*Voss. Q.* 69; see Hessels' edition, s.v.). Our gloss suggests Festus; and since we have grounds for believing that *Ampl. II.* contains *Abol.* items which are omitted by *Vat.*, we may believe either 262, 8 or 262, 20 (or both) to be a Festus gloss of *Abolita*. But with reservations only; for we must remember Servius' note (on *Aen.* 7, 109) *ador proprie est genus farris*. And the gloss *Adoreis* might come not directly from Festus, but from a marginal note on such passages as Paul. *Nol. epist.* 18, 10 *adoreis coronatum*. All this illustrates the uncertainty which dogs our footsteps when we have to do with glossaries in MSS. of Charlemagne's time or later. 51. (269, 5) *Atellanus cantor e Campania; Atella enim ciuitas est in Campania*. 59. (270, 38) *Batioca: patera*. 53. (272, 28) *Broccus: qui labrum superius tumidum habet*. Cf. Philox. 31, 20 *Broccus: ὁ τὸ ἄνω χεῖλος φθγκῶς*. 54. (276, 16) *Cette: date*. Cf. Nonius 120, 31 *Cette significat dicite uel date*. The Nonius Glossary has (639, 4) *Cette: dic<i>te*. 55. (277, 4) *Cillit (-et): quatit, concutit, mouet* (reversed in 283, 11). 56. (277, 10) *Cilo: homo caput longum habens*. Cf. Cyrill. 364, 16 *Μακροκέφαλος: cilo*. 57. (278, 6) *Clacendix: concha*. 58. (278, 7) *Clarigatio: pignoratiorum rerum*. Cf. Philox. 101, 56 *Clarigatio: ἐνεχυρίασις, ὀμνήρια*. 59. (278, 8) *Caudicariae naues onerariae*. 60. (279, 42) *Contamini: interrogamini*. The AA Glossary has (446, 68) *Contasti: interrogasti*. Since the traditional text of Plautus *Cas.* 571 (*Rogitare oportet prius et contari*) is badly in need of support, I do not like to keep back these two witnesses, doubtful though they be. And why *contol* (r) 'I ply the punt-pole,' 'investigate' should not have existed before *percontor* is hard to see; or why *prius*, the original quantity, should not have been recognized by Plautus along with *prius*, as *rei* with *rei*, *fui* with *fui*, not to mention *illius* with (un-Plautine ?) *illius*. To emend a traditional *Rogitare oportet prius et percontari*; to substitute what *ought* to be the older setting, *Rogitare oportet prius et contari*, this would be bold but justifiable. But to refuse to accept the antique setting when all our MSS. present it is mere folly. 'Take the good the gods provide thee.' 61. (281, 62) *Conliquiae: imbrum collectio*. 62. (281, 68) *Conuassassem: furassem*. A Terence gloss; cf. Nonius 87, 27. 63. (282, 21) *Cracentes: graciles*. 64. (282, 39) *Crea: stercus, spurcitia*;

unde excreare: spurcitia<m> eicere. Cf. ps.-Plac. 13, 22 Crea: stercus; unde nos ea quae ex ore abicimus excreare dicimus, id est expuere. 65. (285, 30) Demagis: uehemens. Cf. Philox. 42, 29 Demagis: σφοδρῶς. Our compiler probably misread σφοδρῶς, although the adverb *uehementer* appears in the Abavus maior Glossary. 66. (287, 17) Diabatra: genus calcei muliebris. Naevius' famous description of Dionysus may have been quoted by Festus both s.v. Diabathra and Epicrocum. 67. (287, 34) Dicier: dici, constitui. This cannot be a Persius gloss, for in his line the verb does not mean 'appoint.' 68. (288, 11) Euitauerit: effocauerit. 69. (294, 47) Ferentarii: signiferi uel uexilliferi. Is this a misunderstanding of Nonius 554? 70. (297, 25) Futat: arguit. Cf. Philox. 74, 45 Futat: ἐλέγχει. 71. (299, 63) Hallus: sextus digitus (!). 72. (324, 65) Praefica: mulier lamentatrix ante feretrum. Possibly a misunderstanding of Festus (cf. Paul. 250 quasi in hoc ipsum praefectae). This gloss formerly was neighbour of the item (320, 26) Pergenuat, an indication that the glossary has, in our MS., departed from the earlier arrangement. 73. (327, 40) Ramuscularios: qui ramulum unum tenent, id est qui conducunt a fisco et tenent quasi portiunculam quandam ipsius teloni. An interesting gloss of uncertain origin. 74. (329, 42) Rumen: quidam sinus in gula certorum animalium in quo seruant cibos quos propterea narrandus (*leg.* postea massant?). 75. (329, 43) Rudis: uenia et emissio amphitheatro ut iam non pugnent gladiatores. 76. (329, 53) Rudus: stercus quod de domo mundatur. Does not agree with the Festus lemma. Possibly from an explanation of *eruderare*, an ecclesiastical Latin word. 77. (329, 55) Rudens: asinus (-ni?) uox (uocans?). Cf. Fest. 322 Rudentes, restes nauticae, et asini cum uoces mittunt. 78. (331, 63—332, 1) Seplasiium: uicus in Campania ubi sunt unguentarii, Seplasiarii: qui ibi sunt. 79. (332, 62) Sigillaria: a signis; quasi signa sunt enim ueterum temp(or)um?) 80. (333, 17) Sodes: si audis (*leg.* -es). Cf. the Nonius Glossary (647, 69) Sodes: si audis. Cf. Nonius 177, 21 (Sodes, non ut apud comicos, sed: si audes. Cicero in *Oratore* . . . 'ut sodes prout si audes'). Cf. Fest. 382 Sodes, si audes. Another illustration of the uncertainty attending a Carolingian gloss. How can we determine the actual source? The next pair should perhaps be omitted. 81. (535, 35) Vestiarium: erogatio uestis quam accipit miles. 82. (335, 48) Vexillatio: numerus militum cum uexillis. 8. (337, 23) Utpote significat ut possumus, ut potestis, ut possunt; nam 'pote' et 'non pote' potest et non potest dicunt Tusci (*leg.* rustici?).

Our glossary has suffered greatly in transcription. Often we could hardly recognize a gloss without the help of kindred glossaries. Where these fail us extreme caution is necessary. Now indeed that we have learnt that one constituent is a Virgil collection we need not hesitate to refer to *Aen.* 1, 3 and 5 the pair (311, 44-45) Multum: diu, Multa quoque: diuersa post circumdatus(?) And we may find the *per ora nouem* of *Aen.* 1, 245 in the confused transcription of (319, 42-43) Peroram nomen, Pernem ouem perouem. But Loewe was too rash in his emendation of (283, 24) Damde date. He proposed Danite: date.



We have no reason to look for this *n*-form outside the 3 Plur. (*danunt*, *explenunt*, *nequinunt*, etc.). If we could light upon a passage in any author where *dandae* could be understood (misunderstood) as *datae*, the simple and certain emendation would be *Dandae: datae*. Or it may be a 'headless' gloss, e.g. <Daticiae>: *dandae, datae*. An Early Latin comparative *clunior* and superlative *clarimum* are welcome. But we cannot be sure we have them in (282, 38) *Criuror: nobilior*, (277, 47) *Clammum: clarissimum*, until *Abauus Maior* comes to the rescue with *Clunior: nobilior*, and the *Liber Glossarum* with its *Clarimum: clarissimum*. Nor may we venture to connect the *forago* of *Festus* (cf. *Paul*. 80) with the corrupt (293, 36) *Fate (-etum): foragem (far-)*. The corruption is quite as likely to conceal *Vortex: uorago*. Nor yet is *lucrio* assured for (309, 14) *Lucar: uenator (leg. fenerator?) auarus*. Nor *impuratus* for (321, 4) *Pi[r]atus: sceleratus, purga<bi>lis, piabilis*. Nor *rupex* for (329, 54) *Rupem: saxum fortem*. Rather *forte* 'large', as *forte* (*portae* MSS.) 'loud' in the *Abolita* gloss (102, 45) *Iubilum: sibilum* ('whistle') *forte*. A *Virgil* gloss (on *Aen.* 9, 486) may lurk in (297, 33) *Funus funera replentes sepultura plangere sepelire* (e.g. <Funera>: *funus, Funerae: flentes <in> sepultura, <unde> plangere: sepelire*).

The English branch of glossary-tradition deserves respect, for the half-uncial *Corpus Glossary* (now in the library of Corpus College, Cambridge; formerly of Canterbury) has been ascribed by Bradshaw ('non futtilis auctor') to the closing years of Aldhelm's life. In the gloss just mentioned, it offers *Dande: date*. A Latin word (unknown to our dictionaries) for 'byre' lurks in its *Bolia: stabula boum*. (Cf. *Gram. Lat.* I. 551, 15 *Bouus: βοῦκόλιον*; I. 75, 15 *bubus*, only Sing.; the glosses cited in *Thes. Gloss. s.v. Bucolia*, e.g. the *Abauus* gloss of bilingual origin, IV. 314, 53 *Bulum: bucolium pastoris*.) The *Épinal Glossary* (formerly at *Moyenmoutier*) in the same type of script, Anglo-Saxon half-uncial, may be as old; although Sir E. M. Thompson pronounces for a hundred years later, the beginning of the ninth century. So that the *Abolita* glosses in this English group give us a glimpse at some very early MS.<sup>1</sup> which found its way to England (or to English foundations in the adjacent part of the Continent). Their *Plautis auribus: magnis* (V. 383, 39) enables us to correct the form of this *Festus* gloss in *Vat.* and *Cass.* Italy seems to have got the *Abolita* glosses from a minuscule MS. of Spain in which *Abolita* was combined with *Abstrusa*. Until a special investigation has been made, we may accept as likely the hypothesis that the same (or another) Spanish minuscule MS. of *Abstr.-Abol.* found its way to England; for Spanish symptoms like *pro* for *per* are perhaps still visible in the English group. The *Abstrusa* gloss *Bubulcus*, written as a Spanish scribe (and other scribes too) would write it, *Vuulcus* (*Vubulcus*), appears in the V-section of *Vat., Cass.*, etc. In the MS. which reached England *uuulcus* or *uubulcus* (with Spanish minuscule *v*) was at first deciphered by the English transcriber as *aubulcus*. The

<sup>1</sup> The *Abstrusa* gloss *Falarica* has its right derive from a source with the wrong form *arlas* form in *Ampl. I.*, whereas all other glossaries for (*h*)*ustas*.



suprascription of the correct opening syllable produced *aububulcus* and the like. The Corpus Glossary (see Hessels' edition) has *Aubulcus*: pastor bouum; the Épinal Glossary, *Aububulcus*: pastor bouum. There is an Abolita gloss *Arcites*: sagittarii. It appears in *Vat.* as (21, 18) *Arcistes*: sagittarius. In the MS. which reached England it had the same corrupt form. The Corpus and Épinal Glossaries have *Arcister*: strelbora (Ags. for 'shaft-bearer') as well as *Arcistis*: sagittarius (-ris). Aldhelm adorns his letter to Eahfrid with the phrase 'utpote belliger in meditullio campi *arcister*'. The interpretation of the gloss Balbus in the English group is curious, Balbus: qui dulcem linguam habet. It reminds us of Chaucer's friar:

Somewhat he lisped for his wantonness,  
To make his English sweet upon his tongue.

The Épinal Glossary is what is usually called the 'First Amplonian Glossary' (Ampl. I.). Goetz prints it (in V., pp. 337-401) not from the Épinal MS., but from the Erfurt MS. already mentioned. From Loewe's account (*Prodr.* pp. 113 sqq.) it too appears to be a 'duorum conscriptio glossariorum in unum'. The two constituents were kept distinct. The second, arranged by AB-, resembles Ampl. II.; the first, arranged by A-, resembles the Corpus Glossary. In discussing Ampl. I. glosses we must therefore mention whether they belong to part ii. of the section or part i. From part ii. we can glean for our list the following items (omitted in Ampl. II.): 84. (346, 41) A[u]xillae: alae minores. Probably from Philox. 26, 43 A[u]xillae: μικρά πτερὰ, ὡς Βάππων. But Philox. took it from Festus. 85. (355, 36) Cascum: antiquum. This gloss appears also in part i. (351, 39). Cf. Cyrill. 392, 32 Παλαιός: uetus, uetustus, cascus. 86. (363, 57) Genusia (*leg.* Ger-): senatus. 87. (383, 40) Plutus (*leg.* Petilus): gracili corpore. This gloss follows Plautis auribus: magnis (already mentioned), which accounts for the Épinal MS. reading Plautis (for Plutus). Part i. of Ampl. I. draws occasionally from the Virgil commentaries of Servius and 'Servius auctus' (i.e. Donatus?), items which we may ascribe to that full version of Abstrusa which I would call 'Abstrusa maior': e.g. (364, 33) Hera: terra, unde heroes, (364, 43) Hernae: saxa Sabinorum lingua, (369, 35) Lucumones: reges. Also from Isidore, e.g. *Deportatus* (355, 65) and *Relegatus* (386, 40). So we must glean with caution: 88. (361, 32) Forda sus: praegnans. 89. (371, 19) Murcus: curtus. 90. (380, 40) Portisculo: malleo. Cf. Aldhelm *de Virg.* (prose) 2 hortante proreta et crepitante naucleru portisculo. The Ampl. I. i. glosses usually suggest a source like Philox. (or III.). A Nonius gloss is apparently (351, 33) Culina: coquina.

Another of the English group (printed in II., pp. 563-597), the third glossary in the Erfurt MS., known as the 'Glossae Nominum' (Gloss. Nom.) or the 'Absonum Glossary,' need not detain us. Goetz (in his preface to Loewe's unfinished edition) pronounces it a very ignorant compilation from bilingual sources; e.g. Cyrill. 217, 2 (Ἀγορανόμος: aedilicius) appears as (565, 14) Aedilicius: publicae legis gnarus; Cyrill. 470, 41 (Φηγός: fagus,

aesculus) as (565, 8) Aesculus: uorax. We may however credit the compiler (or the scribe?) with conscientiousness for his (568, 16) Aritudo: siccitas; *apitudo in exemplari habetur*. Omitting the (possible or probable) Festus glosses which are to be found in our Philox. and in our Cyrill. and those known from the other glossaries already mentioned, we may add from it to our list: 91. (564, 18) Adasia: pro senectute sterilis. Presumably a misrepresentation of a Festus gloss of the bilingual source, since our glossary exhibits ludicrous mistranslations of Greek words. 92. (573, 35) Cliue: difficile. Cf. Paul. 56, 20 omnia enim difficilia cliuia uocabant. 93. (576, 20) Deuerbium: canticum quod ante mortuum canitur. 94. (580, 42) Fritamentum: uox merulae. 95. (581, 12) Galas (*leg. Cala*, i.e. *Kāla*): genus ligni.

In spite of the compiler's ignorance, Gloss. Nom. should be investigated. We must, I think, accept the statement in the title 'Item Aliae XVI. Exiguae Secuntur,' that the compilation was made out of sixteen small collections (possibly the 'glossae collectae' of sixteen texts). Since only nouns (and adjectives) were selected, the field for selection would have to be large (though indeed the Leyden Glossary edited by Hessels is amassed from forty-eight). That separate 'Glossae Nominum' and 'Glossae Verborum' were in vogue we may infer from the second half of the title of Ampl. II. (already mentioned), with its distinction of 'uerba' and 'nomina.' An Irish compiler would know Greek: Englishmen learned in Ireland the little Greek they knew: the natives of the 'Franco-Saxon' region would know practically none. While bilingual collections may indeed have reached France from (South) Italy, the more natural route would be from Ireland through England. So any investigation of Gloss. Nom. and other glossaries which draw from bilingual sources should watch for a clue to (South) Italy or to Ireland. The only clues I have noticed to the history of Gloss. Nom. are: (1) The *certe* in the item Legio (586, 20; cf. *certus* in the Abavus gloss), emended by Goetz to *circiter*, may be a first attempt to decipher the 6000-symbol which is preserved in this item in a glossary written at Cambrai after 831 (Laon 201), viz. the sickle-shaped 6-symbol with a stroke above. This symbol I have never found in an Insular MS. In the Cambrai MS. it is followed by the words *sex milia*. (2) There is a fusion of two glosses (or three, if we add Manducare) at 595, 20, Teritigo (*leg. Tentigo*) and Maturissime. The former seems to come from Cyrill. (308, 19), the latter to be a marginal (and therefore imperfect) excerpt from Charisius 205, 12 K. bearing on the adverb (!) *maturissime*. How did the Charisius excerpt come there?

St. Gall was a meeting-place of Italian, Frankish and Insular (English as well as Irish) culture. Since Sangall. has glosses of the 'English group,' it is possible that our theory of its Bobbio origin is not the whole truth. (The Bobbio glossary fragment, published by Pascal in *Boll. Filol. class.* 11, 88 from the eighth-century MS., Ambr. F. 60 sup., is an excerpt from Sangall.) The St. Gall. MS., written in that rude uncial which is so hard to date, may indeed be as old as *Vat.* But since it is a composite extract-glossary, it offers

no such secure footing for the hunter of Festus glosses as the Abolita portions of *Val.*, where we have an uninterpolated (though probably defective) text of a compilation which appears to have begun each section originally with a batch of Festus items. It seems unadvisable to extend our inquiry to the other patchwork extract-glossaries of Charlemagne's time or later. We cannot hope for certainty there.

But there is a small glossary, the Ab Absens Glossary (Ab Abs.), which provides some additions to our list. It is printed (from the same Leyden MS. as Aff.) in IV. pp. 404-427, with an apparatus of variants culled from half a dozen MSS. (e.g. an eighth-century MS. from the St. Gall scriptorium). Its Festus glosses, as Goetz has pointed out (*De Astrabae Plauti fragmentis*, Jena, 1893), are practically confined to the A-section: their source seems to be Philox. (e.g. the gloss Adasia, already cited from Gloss. Nom., appears with the interpretation 'ouis maior natu'). Excluding items already gleaned elsewhere, we get: 96. (405, 7) Aemidus: tumidus, sufflatus. Cf. Philox. 12, 1 Aemidus: πεφυσημένος. 97. (405, 11) Aequilatum: aequatio. Goetz' identification with the Festus lemma Aequilauum seems very doubtful. It may be a late Latin coinage. 98. (405, 33) Albula: fluuius in Italia qui nunc Tiberis uocatur. Rather a Virgil gloss (from *Aen.* 8, 331) than a Festus gloss. 99. (405, 43) Amusus: tacitus, non mutiens. Possibly a mere medieval explanation of ἄμουςος, possibly the Festus gloss Amussim deflected (and distorted) through a Philox. channel. 100. (406, 14) Arculus: circulus; quod ubique arceat. Possibly another medieval etymology. 101. (406, 28) Astraba: tabella ubi pedes requiescunt. Cf. Philox. 22, 15 Astraba: σάνις ὑποπόδιον. Also the Ags. gloss Astraba: fotbret ('footboard'). 102. (406, 33) Atanuuium (-nulum, -nulo MSS.): genus uasis. Cf. Philox. 22, 47 At[n]anulus: ἄγιον ἱερέως σκεῦος, κειμήλιον.

Another source of Ab Abs., as Goetz has shown, is a collection of Virgil glosses, presumably marginal notes in a text of Virgil. (So we may refer 416, 20 to *Aen.* 6, 162 Misenum Aeoliden.) The use of such Virgil marginalia in compiling a glossary seems to have been widely prevalent (I have not been able to see Pokrowsky's Russian article, mentioned in *Burs. Jahresb.* 113, 220). The glossary used by Aff. and Ampl. II. we found to draw from Virgil marginalia. The compiler of Abol. used an annotated MS. of the same stock as the MS. on which was based the Virgil Glossary (IV., 427-470, printed from the same Leyden MS. as Ab Abs.). The compiler of the AA glossary (AA) employs a collection culled from some South Italian MS. whose interpretations were often Greek (see Theander's *AA Glossarum Commentarioli*, Upsala, 1907; where, however, these South Italian items are not always distinguished from the Virgil glosses transferred from Abol., etc., into AA). 'Ansileubus', to judge from Hagen's (faulty) illustration of the VIRGL. items in the Liber Glossarum (in pp. 453-529 of the Appendix Seruiana) seems to have used two annotated Virgil MSS. For while phrases which occur twice in Virgil (e.g. *Aen.* 1, 394 and 9, 638 aetheria plaga; *Aen.* 1, 191 and 4, 71 agens telis) can furnish three

glosses, a phrase which occurs only once (e.g. *Ecl.* 6, 64 Aonas in montes; *Aen.* 2, 492 ariete crebro) does not furnish more than two (if the second item under Arte Pelasga refers to *Aen.* 2, 106 artisque Pelasgae, and belongs properly to No. 601 of Hagen's list). But the most valuable Virgil glosses are those in Abstrusa, for they seem to come from some (Insular?) 'uariorum' commentary (like Adamnan's); and their full form is only to be recovered from not merely the MSS. of Abstrusa used by Goetz, but from the lemmas of 'Abstrusa maior' scattered through the English group of glossaries and the Liber Glossarum. All these collections of Virgil glosses deserve investigation, and the investigator armed with Merguet's *Lexikon zu Virgilius*, should note any clear use of the Appendix Vergiliana; for Vollmer's details of the text-tradition might thereby be increased.

In Ab Abs. we find also Abstr. and Abol. items, presumably transferred from a composite Abstr.-Abol., and sometimes most ignorantly transferred. We must not take seriously its (405, 49) Angiportus: refugium naus uel uia sine exitu, hoc est profugatus (-tu?) quodam. It is merely the compiler's apprehension of Abol. 17, 40 Angiportum, androna uiformium uel callem (cf. 410, 40-41 from Abstr. 70, 10). It furnishes however a variant reading, for it shows that his MS. had something like *andro nauiforium* (or *nauiforium* alone). Other absurd explanations are clearly mistranslations of Greek words in the bilingual source. But a few leave us in doubt whether the compiler is to blame or rather the medieval annotators of some texts whose marginalia he used (and the same may be said of Gloss. Nom.). The compiler may be responsible for (417, 2) Nepotes feminae: perditae feminae (elicited from Neptis: nepos femina) and (405, 2) Adueruncat (for Auerruncat): multum uerum facit; the annotator for (419, 4) Patibulum: res patens, and (420, 4) Pote: forsitan. To a parade of the knowledge of the privative particle in Greek we may perhaps refer (405, 18) Afuturus: non est futurus; of the Greek word for 'end', the colophon of the OS-group (418, 18) OS τέλος fin(is). Its (417, 6) Neli: noli is merely Neu: noli (as in AA).

However illiterate this glossary may be, its age makes it useful in gloss-tracking. The three ancient tribes of Rome were (Fest. 484, etc.) the Titienses, Ramnes (-netes) and Luceres. We get from Sangall. (278, 4) Ramnensis: tribus a Romulo constituta; from Ampl. I. ii. (388, 15) Ramnetes: equites a Romulo constituti. Our glossary offers the corrupt (415, 5) Licerceris: centurio (Luceres: centuriae?, Luceris *corr. ex* Lucer: decurio?). AA, which seems to draw partly from an Ab Abs. archetype, shews merely (486, 27) Titiensis clangor (apparently not one of the many Festus glosses of Abol. which AA alone has preserved for us). Our MSS. of Ab Abs. read (424, 46) Titiensis clangor: id est sonitus cum tumultu, (425, 25) Tumultus: clangor, id est sonitus cum tumultu. The truth may be that in the earlier MSS. of Ab Abs. the gloss Titiensis was unprovided with an interpretation and was a neighbour of the gloss Tumultus. (In our MSS. the items have been rearranged in fairly strict alphabetical order.) Also that a long gloss (a Virgil

gloss perhaps rather than a Festus gloss) on the three ancient Roman tribes stood in some early glossary (Abstrusa major?) from which these (North Frankish?) compilers borrowed, and has survived only in fragments. And it is not impossible that our glossary exhibits the true form in (423, 41) Sobrius nomen est (i.e. plays the part of a noun, 'a sober man'; perhaps in some verse of the Bible), where AA shows (480, 33) Robrius nomen est (supposed to be a Juvenal gloss, from Juv. 4, 105; just as Abav. offers Stratocles: ad militiam accitus, possibly from Juv. 3, 99; compare the Abol. gloss Lysimachus: solutus belli[tis], if that is the true reading—or the more learned *solutor*, with Housman—, conceivably from Juv. 7, 204). AA, which abounds in 'doublets', offers also (480, 27) Rodoricus: nomen est unius regis (rather, with Theander, Roderigo of Spain than Rhodri of Wales); and this may be nothing more than an (Italian?) attempt at emendation, just as the AA item, Tiberius nomen est unius imper(atoris), may have been suggested by the Festus gloss printed next to it by Goetz (V. 486, 19). And the true form of another 'will-of-the-wisp' may be our glossary's (423, 5) Seseque: et se, *ταυτολογία* (i.e. repetition of *se*); whence the puerile glosses mentioned in Thes. Gloss. s. vv. Seseque and Seque. We get no clue to the home of Ab Abs. from the ubiquitous symbol ciū 'ciuitas' -tatis, etc. of 414, 23 and 44 and 47.

The Abavus Glossary, printed (in IV., pp. 301-403) from the same North Frankish MS. as Ab Abs. and Aff., swarms with 'doublets'. The ignorance of the compiler enforces caution on us, e.g. in treating (318, 5) Cesp<it>es: glebae, aratores, rustici. This at first sight suggests that *caespes* was a Latin (Comedian's?) term for 'blockhead' like Plautus' *frutex* (*Most.* 13). But in the G-section we find (347, 11) Gleba (-bo): arator, rusticus; and this is clearly the Abol. gloss (83, 22) Glebo: rusticus, arator. The immediately preceding Abol. gloss is (83, 21) Gleba: cespes durus. The likelihood therefore is that the Abav. compiler merely concocted his gloss out of these two neighbouring Abol. items. We have the gloss (as so many Abav. glosses) in reversed form, the original form having been Glebae: aratores, rustici, caespites. The same Abol. gloss has produced a misleading item in Ampl. I., Glebra: arator lingua Gallica. Vernacular equivalents (prefaced or followed by 'uulgo dictum' or 'rustice' or the like; cf. Loewe, *Prodr.* p. 416) are common in glossaries (e.g. Manubrium quod rustici manicum dicunt), and the compiler of Ampl. I. interpreted in this sense the *rusticus* of his source. That he should have understood the vernacular of his source to be Gaulish Latin (or Gaulish) is an indication of the source's home.

Abav. is perhaps the most illiterate of all the glossaries printed in Vols. IV. and V. In its Rure: rupes uel petrae (388, 5) the first word is probably a mere miswriting of *rupes* left undeleted, like (367, 17) [Namo]: narro, (368, 29) [Nidar] nidor: odor; also probably (330, 52) [Diennium] biennium, (331, 30) [Dimus] bimus, forms which should be sternly ignored by linguists. In a more respectable glossary we might perhaps seek a trace of e.g. Rusticus: rupex uel petro (cf. Fest. 226, 25), but not in this one. Doubt attaches to its

(381, 35) Propedat : inpedat, cohibet, prohibet (a mistake for Praepedit?). Its best point is that it has preserved for us some Republican glosses of Philox. omitted in our (practically) unique Philox. MS., glosses often accompanied by the word ἀρχ(αίως) : e.g. Infans : ἀρχαίως indisertus (reversed in 352, 46) ; Ebitere : ἀρχαίως egredi (reversed in 335, 6) ; Inciens : ἀρχαίως gravida (351, 45) ; Ipsus ἀρχαίως saepius ipse (357, 36). Other examples are given by Loewe (*Opusc.* 102), who finds *arnantia* in the puzzling (310, 52) Armentia : ἀρχαίως essentia, extantia. Its *pecusius* (374, 50) may be the true reading for our MS. of Philox. 144, 2 Pecuosus : ποιμὴν ἀρχαίως. And its (377, 18) *pipiunculus* (from *pipio* 'pigeon'?) must be weighed against the reading in our MS. of Cyrill. 347, 12 Κερυχίς : εἶδος ἱέρακος μικροῦ, titiunculus (from *titus* 'wood-pigeon', according to Buecheler in *Arch. Lat. Lex.* 2, 119). It is presumably from Philox. that it takes (319, 24) Clingit : cludit ; (352, 55) Indupedat : inpedat (reversed in 354, 51 Inpedit : praepedit, indopedat) ; (357, 37) Hippago : aurigarius (a misunderstanding of Festus' *uehuntur*?) ; (361, 8 and 12) Limauit : sociauit ; (377, 15) Pilicrepus : pilarius. Perhaps even (352, 47) Indigitat : inuocat ; (372, 39) Orcinus : morte manumissus. Hardly (367, 24) Natinare (*leg. -ri*) : negotiare (*-ri*) ; cf. Fest. 166, 6. Its Laetrus : laeues (359, 44) is a deterioration of Philox. (120, 20) Laetrum : ἀπιστερόν. The Nom. would be rather *laeter* (like *dexter*). Like Ab Abs. it often retains the Greek<sup>1</sup> word of its bilingual original and in Greek lettering. We are reminded of Festus (cf. Paul. 86, 13) by the long gloss (353, 53) Ingruit : cum turba uenit et impetu ; retractum (?) est autem hoc a gruibus qui simul uolant ; inde (id est MSS.) congruere conuenire est. (It may be a Virgil gloss.) Perhaps also by (323, 44 and 60) Consponsores : alterutrum fide dicentes (-tri fidem Scal.) ; cf. the AA Glossary's Conspopondit : pariter spondit.

The resolution of the Abavus Glossary into its constituent elements is impossible in its present strict alphabetical re-arrangement, but might have been attempted if it had remained at the A-stage indicated by the fusion at 318, 31, which shows (*pace* Loewe) that in this previous stage Cisiarius immediately preceded Commatibus. The two main constituents seem to be (as of Sangall.) (1) Philox., (2) Abstr.-Abol. Of the others may be discerned : (3) a source of Ampl. II. (witness the grammatical group 348, 12 and 14-16, along with 349, 22 and 30) ; (4) the Cologne fragmentary glossary described by Goetz in p. xlii of the preface. But indeed Abavus seems to have connecting links with most of the glossaries in Vol. IV. and to furnish many a clue to their history and inter-relation.

Now that we have the *Thesaurus Glossarum Emendatarum* to show us what is the correct form of each gloss and what form each assumes in the various glossaries, and further to enable us to find in a moment any item of any

<sup>1</sup> Scribes unfamiliar (as were most scribes) with Greek omit these. My notes from a Bodleian MS. (*Auct. T.* ii. 24) of the expanded form of our glossary (Abav. major) show that the true version of 366, 51 is *Musciniarius* : inutilis,

ἀχρηστος, and of 390, 7 Scutit : cattat, ἀδανειν. So these are Philox. glosses, and we must not change *inutilis* to *mutinus*. This MS. has for 388, 5 Rura : agros, uilla, possessio uel tellus, rupes uel petrae.

collection, the task of investigating the lineage and relationship of glossaries devolves on younger scholars. They are not so liable now to the error which has made so many of these dissertations valueless, the error of treating a glossary as if its items were all discovered by the compiler and not borrowed in great part from already existing glossaries. The manner of investigation is very simple. With the help of *Thes. Gloss.* one separates those items of a glossary which can be traced to the two main sources of all these collections: viz.: (1) a bilingual source of our Philox.-Cyrill. (a reference in *Thes. Gloss.* to Vol. II. of the *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* characterizes such items), (2) Abstr.-Abol. (a reference to any page between p. 3 and p. 198 of Vol. IV. characterizes these). Then one sifts the residue (with the help of *Thes. Gloss.*), separating those items which are peculiar to the glossary investigated. The items common to it with others one examines in the hope of being able to determine that this or that glossary must have used (or have been used by) the glossary investigated, or that both have drawn from a common source. Until all this preliminary work of investigation has been done, Latin glosses are not rightly available for study: a student is in danger of mistaking the casual guess of a mediaeval monk for the deliberate pronouncement of an ancient grammarian or commentator. To any volunteer let me give this advice: First read Gundermann's review in *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 21 (1901), pp. 974 sqq. and Goetz' article 'Glossographie' in Pauly-Wissowa.

W. M. LINDSAY.

THE UNIVERSITY,  
ST. ANDREWS.

gre  
the  
ear  
its  
was  
by  
intr  
who  
with  
mon  
the  
over

it w  
and  
this  
and  
were  
who  
earli  
mon  
Thur  
deiti  
Emp  
almo  
of S  
seem  
advan  
mem  
impo  
kians  
terms  
elem



## BAAL IN HELLAS.

IN proportion to their numbers the Semitic peoples have exercised a greater influence on the course of human history as a whole than any other of the large races of mankind. As far as our records carry us, it appears that the early spirit of exploration and adventure, as distinct from racial migration, had its origin with them. Even in Homeric times, the Phoenician trader or pirate was a familiar feature of the Mediterranean world. Greece, commonly regarded by us as the home of true culture, admitted that she owed to Phoenicia her first introduction to the art of writing. Semitic establishments were spread over the whole of the ancient world, and the only state that ever seriously contested with Rome the sovereignty of the world was Carthage. Though not famed more for military prowess than other races, the Semitic branch of mankind in the seventh century of our era swept over northern Africa and western Asia, overflowing at two points into Europe itself.

This last manifestation of Semitic activity had its stimulus in religion, and it was probably on this side of life that the influence of the Semites was widest and deepest. Christianity is sometimes cited as an illustration of this fact, but this is hardly a fair position. Christianity had its historical roots in Judaism, and Judaism was utterly unlike any other form of Semitic faith. The Jews were the only Semitic people who developed a monotheism, and the only one who made ethics fundamental to religion. As in the Graeco-Roman world, the earliest form of religion among the Semites seems to have been a tribal monolatry, which, by a process of interaction, developed into a polytheism. Thus Nabu, Marduk, Ea, Ishtar and the rest were, in the first instance, local deities, who were arranged into a Pantheon with the growth of the Babylonian Empire. In this respect the history of Semitic religion can be paralleled almost everywhere else in the civilized world. But there were certain aspects of Semitic religion which had no analogue in other races. The tribal sense seems to have been unusually strong, or perhaps to have endured to a more advanced stage in the history of these peoples than in that of others. All the members of the tribe were closely bound together by ties of blood, and the most important member was the unseen one, the god. His connection with his kinsmen of the tribe was thought of in different ways, and described in different terms, but there was always the sense of blood relationship between the human elements in the clan and the divine one. Thus the god was sometimes called

the father of the clan. Sometimes his superiority was expressed by the use of the term Lord or Husband, in the eastern Semitic world Bel, in the western Baal. Thus we have such theophorous names as Belshazzar in Babylon, Meribaal in ancient Israel, Ethbaal in Sidon, and Hannibal in Carthage. The god had his own home in some particular spot, or might dwell in a fountain, a tree, or a stone. It was there that he was to be approached, and it was there that other members of the tribe could enter into communion with him, by sharing with him in a meal consisting of the flesh of one of the domestic animals of the tribe. It was only under such circumstances that beef or mutton or the flesh of the camel or goat might be eaten—otherwise these animals were under a tabu.

There were also sacred persons. These were generally guardians of the shrine or home of the god, or persons otherwise connected with the ritual of the tribe. Their character was not always of the highest, as may be seen from the repeated protests of the great ethical prophets of Israel, especially Hosea and Isaiah. These sacred persons dealt in priestcraft, mantic, and divination. Originally the three classes were clearly distinguished, and in ancient Israel it was the second type alone to which the name of prophet was applied. The last class were properly called 'seers,' though with the progress of the civilization of the people they became merged in the prophets. Thus, in the more ancient narrative, Samuel is a seer, and stands entirely apart from the prophets, who formed a distinct feature in the social and religious life of the time. But probably similar types of sacred persons are to be found in all primitive religions, though they had peculiar characteristics in the Semitic world. Those peculiarities find their most striking illustration in prophecy.

Our ideas of the prophet are mainly based on the canonical prophets of the Old Testament, or rather on certain misconceptions which have sprung up concerning them. They are generally thought of as persons whose duty it was to be able to foretell the future, and no doubt they did do so. But that was only a subsidiary element in their work, a by-product of their exercise of their true function. That function—at least as far as the canonical prophets were concerned—was to be preachers and teachers of righteousness. It was theirs to state ethical principles, and this of necessity involved the prediction of consequences which would ensue if those principles were observed or neglected. But in this the prophets of Israel were unique, while they shared to no small extent in the external features common to all the Syrian prophets.

The most obvious of these external features was what is called the prophetic ecstasy. This was a peculiar psychic condition in which the subject seemed to be possessed of powers, indeed of a whole sphere of consciousness, which was denied to the ordinary individual, and to the prophet himself in normal states. He did not cease to be conscious of the world as it appeared to others, but he saw and heard things which were beyond their range. There were a number of well-marked physical phenomena connected with the condition of ecstasy, though these were not invariable. The subject might be

affect  
resem  
largel  
as the  
song.  
slash  
physi  
uncon  
victor  
Isaiah  
state,  
were  
comp  
behav  
them  
were  
servic  
upon  
at len  
some  
horns  
incon  
consi  
high  
them,  
proph  
mess  
those  
The p  
soldie  
(Jer.  
V  
there  
Cana  
purpo  
nation  
as th  
religi  
the R  
danci  
Anoth  
proph  
dwell  
ticula

affected with a certain constriction of the muscles, in which case the state resembled that of the trance. On the other hand, muscular activity might be largely increased. Leaping, bodily contortions, and loud cries resulted, which, as they tended to become regular and rhythmical, developed into dancing and song. The subject frequently experienced a kind of anaesthesia, and would slash wildly at his own body with knife or whip, without showing any signs of physical pain. In the less intense forms of the state, symbolic action was not uncommon. In 1 Kings xxii. 11, Zedekiah makes horns of iron, to typify the victory which he promised to King Ahab, and similar action is recorded of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. There was a certain contagion attaching to the state, and persons coming into contact with those who were under its influence were likely to be seized with the same impulse. Thus when Saul meets a company of 'prophets,' he himself 'prophesies'—i.e. falls into the ecstasy and behaves like the ecstasies. The result was that the prophets tended to form themselves into companies, and to live a social life. These swarms of ecstasies were common all over Palestine and Syria, and were normally devoted to the service of some particular deity who was supposed to send his (or her) 'spirit' upon them. When the ecstasy fell on the crowd, it commonly happened that at length one stood out from the rest and uttered significant words, or performed some symbolic act. Thus in 1 Kings xxii. 11, Zedekiah takes the lead with his horns of iron, and it is he who smites Micaiah for having uttered a prophecy inconsistent with the voice of the majority. It is not surprising, when one considers the conditions of the ecstasy, to find that the 'prophets' did not stand high in the social scale. Amos indignantly repudiated all connection with them, and there are frequent denunciations of them throughout the canonical prophets, who, however, differed from the rest mainly in the content of their message. Indeed the phenomena of ecstatic prophecy seem to have resembled those of insanity. Saul's ravings are called 'prophecy' in 1 Sam. xviii. 10. The prophet who came to anoint Jehu was called a 'madman' by the assembled soldiers (2 Kings ix. 11), and the same word was hurled at Jeremiah (Jer. xxix. 26).

While the ecstatic state was not strictly under the control of the prophet, there were certain stimuli which could be employed to excite it. Amongst the Canaanitish prophets alcohol and other drugs were frequently used for this purpose. The prophets of Israel, standing as they did for the worship of their national God, seem to have been hostile to the use of wine, which was regarded as the gift and property of the Canaanitish Baals. Certainly two of the religious guilds which were in spirit allied to the prophets, the Nazirites and the Rechabites, wholly eschewed the vine and all its products. But music and dancing were almost universally employed as stimuli, cf. 2 Kings iii. 15. Another mode not infrequently to be observed in the case of the greater prophets was that of concentrating the gaze on some object and perhaps dwelling on its name till the inspiration came. This seems to have been particularly frequent with Amos and Jeremiah, and may be illustrated from the

first prophetic experience of the latter. At the time of his call his eye fell on the branch of an almond tree, whose name in Hebrew was *shaged*. Contemplation of this object brought to the ear of his second sense the word *shoged*—'awake,' and he heard the voice telling him that this was the inner meaning of what he had seen.

Another feature of the ecstasy lies in the fact that it made a more or less lasting impression on the mind of the subject. It differs here from the hypnotic state, which leaves the less impression the more complete it is. The contrary is the case with the ecstatic condition. The more tense and fervid it was, the more clearly was it recalled after it had passed. But for this we should have had far fewer records than we actually possess of the utterances of the prophets. A large proportion of the oracles of the canonical prophets have been handed down from the man's own memory of what he saw and heard whilst in this condition. An illustration may be taken from one of the earlier experiences of Jeremiah. In the year 626 B.C. Judah was threatened and perhaps overrun by the Scythians, who were then invading western Asia. It was with their coming that Jeremiah's prophetic consciousness awoke. The prophecies of this period are contained in chapters iv.-vi. The first oracles are a cry of warning, together with a hint at the desolation which the invaders are working. Then, in iv. 23-26, the prophet falls into yet deeper ecstasy, and, as he looks out on the land, the world dissolves into the primitive elements from which the universe was made. The light of creation was no more, no birds, no men; nothing but a restless sea of heaving mountain and tossing hill met his gaze wherever he turned. The prophet's record of this experience may be roughly paraphrased:

I looked on the earth,  
And lo! Chaos' rude birth;  
At the heavens, and from them no creation-light brake;  
And I looked on the hills  
In their agony thrills,  
And the mountains did totter and tremble and quake.  
I looked o'er the ground,  
And no man there I found;  
And the birds of the heaven had winged far their flight;  
And I saw—as I faced  
Carmel's garden—a waste,  
And its cities were shattered beneath the grim blight.

But the most complete direct account of the ecstasy in the Old Testament is to be found in the familiar narrative of the behaviour of the priests of Baal on Mount Carmel (1 Kings xviii. 20-29).

Similar phenomena were to be found throughout the whole of the world made known to us through classical literature. But in most cases they are to be traced back to Asia Minor and so to Syria, and would probably all be so traceable had we sufficient evidence. A few cases may be taken.

One of the best illustrations is to be found in Apuleius, VIII. 24-29. There we have a description of the way in which the priests of the eastern goddess

prepared themselves and their donkey, their wild leaps and screams, the swords and two-edged knives which they carried, the frenzied slashes which they made at their bare arms, and the furious blows of the whips which were the proper insignia of their priesthood. Though all rave, one is more extravagant than the rest, panting and gasping as though he found himself surfeited with the deity—'for it seems that the goddess makes people worse instead of better.'

Apuleius makes it quite clear that the phenomena which accompanied the ecstasy of these priests was practically identical with that which was so familiar in earlier times in Syria. This is obvious from a comparison of his account with that given of the priests of Baal in Kings. Their goddess was ostensibly Isis, but an examination of the records shows that there must have been a good deal of syncretism. At the close of his work Apuleius expressly identifies Isis with the great nature-goddess of Asia Minor. And the earlier accounts of Isis show that the ecstatic element was properly absent from her worship. Herodotus (II. 61) gives a description of her festival. The only ecstatic people are certain Carian settlers, who beat their foreheads with swords—in the fashion of the priests in Apuleius—and thus, says the historian, prove that they are foreigners and not Egyptians. And there is a story of the eleventh century, preserved in an Egyptian papyrus, which tells of an early point of contact between Egyptians and the prophetic ecstasy. A certain Wen-amon went on a sacred embassy to Byblos, in Phoenicia, bringing with him an image of Amon, whose worship he wished to introduce into Syria. He was at first unsuccessful in his errand, and the Governor, whose name was Zekar-baal—'Baal remembers'—sent daily to the Egyptian ship and required its departure. But after nineteen days of this there was a festival and a sacrifice in honour of the God of Byblos. He is known to classical mythology as Adonis, a name which means Lord, and has therefore some kinship with Baal. At the festival in question a noble youth fell into the ecstasy, and demanded in the name of Adonis that the image should be brought on shore, for Amon also was a god. The prophet's words were attended to, and the embassy was successful.

We may assume that the Egyptians derived their acquaintance with the ecstasy from Syria. In other directions, too, Asiatic conceptions of religion spread over the whole world. The Phoenicians were travellers and traders from prehistoric times, and wherever they went they carried their religion with them. The extent of their movements is obvious to any student of Semitic epigraphy. One of the most important of Semitic ritual inscriptions was found at Marseilles, and traces of Phoenician occupation in the form of inscribed rings and gems have been discovered in the British Isles. Where their settlements were more than mere trading factories, they left behind them features in the life and thought of the people which are unmistakable, and form evidence of their presence hardly less certain than actual inscriptions.

One of the most obvious of these was the prophetic ecstasy. This is so widely spread in the Graeco-Roman world that it is not easy at first to think of it as something foreign to the genius and spirit of those peoples. Yet there can

be little doubt that wherever it occurs it points to a period in the distant past when Syrian influence made itself felt, either by importation or by invasion. That is, in some cases Greeks themselves may have visited Syria and returned with Semitic ideas, or the Phoenicians may have entered the country, bringing with them their own worship. In any case these particular phenomena spread at a very early period in Asia Minor, with which the Greeks were certainly familiar. In two cases especially gods well known in Greece and Rome appear to have a basis in Semitic religious thought. A study of instances where the ecstasy occurs will help to make this clear.

We may begin with the West. The tradition preserved by Livy (I. 7) speaks of a prophetess named Carmenta who lived in Italy before the advent of the Sybil. Whilst this tradition does not tell us very much about Carmenta,

indicates one important fact about the Sybil, namely that she was not indigenous to Italy. As has been frequently remarked, her name seems to have Semitic connections, since it resembles the Hebrew שֵׁבִיעַ—'grey hairs.' On this hypothesis she is 'the old lady of Cumae.' We have no means of knowing how far Virgil's description of her is based on contemporary observation, but it cannot be denied that it presents features which are strange to Roman religion as we know it. Thus:

Cui talia fanti

ante fores, subito non uoltus, non color unus,  
non comptae mansere comae; sed pectus anhelum,  
et rabie fera corda tument; maiorque uideri,  
nec mortale sonans; afflata est numine quando  
iam propiore deo.

*Aen.* VI. 46-51.

This condition is maintained throughout her first utterances, cf. ll. 98-100, but later she grows calmer, and is able to argue philosophically with Aeneas.

It is impossible not to feel that these phenomena are closely allied to those of the genuine Semitic ecstasy. The god in question is Apollo, and if Virgil suspected that there was anything non-Italian in his description, it is probable that his mind travelled to some Greek oracle such as Delphi. What he does not seem to have realized is that these phenomena were not primarily Greek, but came from somewhere further east. Yet Cumae was a Phoenician settlement, and there can be little doubt that the Apollo of that place was a Baal, somewhat disguised, but still recognizable through the veil of Greek and Roman attributes.

One of the most familiar and impressive passages in Greek literature is to be found in the *Agamemnon*, ll. 1072-1130. The travellers have returned from Troy in victory. The king has been induced to enter the house where his doom awaits him at the hands of his faithless wife. One alone remains outside, the captive princess, Cassandra. Clytemnestra makes an attempt to persuade her to follow her master, but finds her dumb and immovable. The queen retires, and as soon as her back is turned the spell that has been laid on

the lips of Cassandra seems to be loosed. She breaks out, but it is into no ordinary speech. Her first words are a wild and almost meaningless appeal to Apollo. One feels the shudder that runs over the chorus and the horror with which they are overwhelmed. As Cassandra's words grow clearer, it becomes evident that she sees something on the roof of the palace which is invisible to the rest, and through her disjointed cries the picture gradually reveals itself. The prophetess sees the forms of the victims of that ancestral blood-fiend who in every generation has exacted his toll of the House of Atreus, and in particular the twisted and dismembered figures of the children of Thyestes. The chorus are infected by her passion, and the scene develops into the Kommos of the play. Cassandra at last resumes a more normal tone, though the emotional tension is still extreme. In l. 1178 she is calm enough to speak in iambs, though the vision has not faded. Nor does it till its place is taken by a picture of the fate of Agamemnon and herself. And even at the end, the house, to her, reeks of blood.

We have in this passage all the familiar phenomena of the Syrian ecstasy. We have the consciousness of the two worlds, the one which ordinary men inhabit and that which is obvious to the sight and hearing of the prophet alone. There is the realization of them both at the same time; while she sees the horrors on the roof, Cassandra is able to carry on her conversation with the chorus. There is a suggestion of the infectious character of the ecstasy; the chorus, though they cannot see and hear what Cassandra sees and hears, are caught by her passion, and in the Kommos proper utter lyrics hardly less powerful than those of the prophetess. The effect of the ecstasy is far from being transient; it leaves its mark on Cassandra even to the point where she leaves the stage and enters the palace. There is the tendency to violent and symbolic action, exhibited when Cassandra, in l. 1267, strips off the emblems of Apollo and hurls them to the ground with some gesture of contempt or fury. Such was the view taken by Aeschylus of the character of the Asiatic prophetess. These phenomena do not appear in the case of the Greek gods proper. Calchas receives his oracles in other ways. The deity who inspires Cassandra is a Baal.

The further research can carry back its enquiry into the origin and character of Apollo, the clearer does it become that this is his true nature. Attempts have been made to locate him with the aid of philology, but these are always open to dispute, and do not really lead to any helpful conclusion. Thus the identification of Leto with the name of the pre-Islamic goddess Al-lât is certainly attractive (the Al- is simply the Arabic article), but is insufficiently attested by historical evidence. But there is more reason to believe that Apollo was an Asiatic deity in the first instance. One naturally thinks of Apollo as coming from Delos, but this is a comparatively late form of the legend. In *Il.* IV. 101 his birth is placed in Lycia—*Λυκείος* has nothing to do with wolves—and though in *Od.* VI. 162 mention is made of an altar of Apollo in Delos and in *Il.* IX. 405 there is a reference to the connection between Apollo



and Delphi, the first direct statement to the effect that Apollo was born in that island appears in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo. Apollo was a later importation into Delos, as appears from the fact that the worship of Astarte and Atargatis—both forms of the Syrian Mother-goddess—was carried on there. Apollo must have entered in the same way. The fact that Apollo in Homer commonly has two names, 'Phoebus Apollo' suggests a composite origin. If that be so, then the first name is clearly Greek, and the second will be a foreign one. Moreover in Homer he is the only god of importance who consistently appears on the side of the Trojans. The other deity who does so is Aphrodite—a typically Asiatic goddess. There is sufficient evidence on the historical side to show that Apollo was not a native Greek god, but an immigrant from Asia, and the association of the ecstasy with him indicates an ultimate Syrian origin.

Whilst practically every city in Greece had more or less intercourse with Phoenicia, the spot at which it would be most natural to seek for traces of her influence is Thebes. The traditions of Thebes were bound up with Phoenicia. Her legends told of Cadmus as her founder. His name is pure Semitic—קדם—and means simply 'the easterner.' Philology is not often a safe guide in these matters, but here the case is too clear to admit of mistake—as in the case of Adonis=אדון. And in the case of Thebes there is more than philology. The whole story is that of migration from Asia. It is only to be expected, then, that other traces of Asiatic influence will be discoverable here. And it may be possible to find them, not in Aeschylus but in Euripides. Again, it is not to be supposed that Euripides is a safe guide to the history of the past. But in his great Theban drama, the *Bacchae*, we may look for what he thought proper to Thebes, and see what impression Theban rites made on him. The phenomena themselves may have been those of his own day, but they must correspond to something which was traditional in Boeotia.

The world of classical studies owes much to Professor Norwood in the matter of the statement and elucidation of the problems raised by the *Bacchae*. Into those problems in general it is hardly possible to go in detail here. They are concerned with artistic and theological questions which lie outside the sphere of the present study. But there is one point which does immediately concern us. That is the nature of the orgy which plays so prominent a part in the development of the plot. It may be taken for granted that this orgy was familiar to the poet, and that when he described the ravings of Agave and her companions, he had in his mind scenes which he had himself witnessed or had had described to him by eyewitnesses.

At the risk of repeating what must be familiar to everyone, it may simplify matters to trace briefly the plot of the *Bacchae*. The chief characters are Dionysus, Cadmus, the founder of Thebes, his grandson, Pentheus, in whose favour the old man has resigned the crown, Teiresias, the ancient seer of Thebes, and Agave, daughter of Cadmus and mother of Pentheus. The chorus is composed of Lydian women who have followed Dionysus to Thebes. It is to be noted that they are Asiatics.

The prologue is spoken by Dionysus himself. He is the son of Semele and Zeus, and therefore the grandson of Cadmus. His relatives, particularly his aunt, Agave, and her sisters, and his cousin Pentheus, have declined to believe in his divine parentage, and he has come to punish them. Agave and her sisters, together with the other women of Thebes, have been driven 'mad,' and have gone out to Cithaeron to celebrate Bacchic rites. After the opening choric ode, Pentheus appears, and states his determination to put down this new movement. Teiresias and Cadmus have already yielded to the stranger, and are now arrayed in the garb proper to the Bacchanals. They argue with Pentheus, but to no purpose, and the only result is a minor persecution of Teiresias. Dionysus is now brought in a prisoner, and after an altercation with Pentheus is confined in the stables attached to the palace. Then an earthquake follows—at least the chorus experience an earthquake—and the tomb of Semele is wrapped in flame. Dionysus appears free and safe, and gives an account of his dealings with Pentheus off the stage. The latter enters and at once sees the prisoner whom he has already missed, but seems quite unconscious of the ruin of the palace or of the earthquake. The dialogue between Dionysus and Pentheus is interrupted by the arrival of a messenger from Cithaeron who tells of the atrocities of the Bacchanal women. Pentheus at once determines to put an end to their proceedings by force, but is persuaded by Dionysus to dress as a Bacchanal and go out to spy on them first. From this point Pentheus himself loses his own self-control, and is as much at the disposal of the god as anyone else among the Bacchants. The two go out together, and the next person who enters the stage is a messenger who describes with ghastly vividness the death of Pentheus at the hands of the Bacchanals. Agave then appears, bearing her son's head, which she imagines to be that of a lion. She is joined by Cadmus, under whose influence she recovers her normal consciousness, and all realize the full horror of the punishment meted out by the god.

There is much relating to the Theban women in this story that cannot be attributed to divine possession on the Syrian model. The ecstasy—and this is, perhaps, the most striking difference between the two—passes off, and does not leave behind the memory of what has been seen and heard during its presence. In this respect it is probably nearer to the hypnotism which Professor Norwood has suggested than to the phenomena which have been observed in other cases. But here it may be once more remarked that what we have in the *Bacchae* is not history or a scientific study of phenomena, but drama. In the mind of the poet this particular manifestation of the ecstasy may have been combined with the more familiar characteristics of intoxication. This appears the more likely when it is recognized that Pentheus himself, when he sets out on his expedition to Cithaeron, is simply drunk. This is possibly the explanation of the way in which he yields to the suggestions of Dionysus in the first place. But it is also not impossible that in his case there is a suggestion of the infectious character of the ecstasy. His experience may

be compared with that of king Saul, who, on meeting a company of the prophets, joined them himself and prophesied, i.e. fell into the prophetic frenzy.

This impression is confirmed by a further study of the play. Agave and her companions are not the only persons who are under a delusion of some kind. The chorus also are faced with facts that are not facts and see things that do not happen. In their case the phenomena are more typical. They feel the earthquake, they see the palace fall in ruins. But no one else in the play is conscious of either event. Professor Norwood was the first to call attention to this difficulty, which is one of the most important in the whole problem. His solution is that the chorus were in fact mesmerized, and this is much the same thing as saying that they were under the influence of the ecstasy. Euripides may have seen the Bacchantes in Macedonia or in Boeotia itself, and the idea of mesmerism might readily occur to him, or at least a comparison with those phenomena to which we give the name of mesmerism. And there is one point in which the experience of these women differs from what we call hypnotism. It is usually necessary for the practitioner himself at least to be present when the hypnotic influence is brought to bear, but when the chorus see the palace fall, Dionysus is still in his stable. Their case is certainly closely paralleled by that of Cassandra in the *Agamemnon*. And it may be included under the same head without doing violence to the work of Euripides.

Further evidence points in the same direction. If there is any point on which the play may be regarded as giving evidence of a historical fact, it is the fact that the religion of Dionysus was not native to Thebes, but was a later introduction. It should, however, be noted that the new god claims to have a common origin with the house of Cadmus. He appears as a Lydian, but it may well be that there were Dionysiac cults found in Lydia in the time of Euripides which were responsible for this position. He was, at any rate, an Asiatic, and a western Asiatic. He is a god of prophecy—so claimed by Teiresias, and since there is in the play no sign of the use of his prophetic gift, we may take it for granted that this was one of his conventional attributes. He was, further, the god of wine. There may have been other cases of gods of wine, and there were certainly other cases of mantic deities, but, as far as we know, the combination of ecstasy, wine and mantic finds no parallel outside Syria and those places whose cults can be directly traced to Syria. In other words, Dionysus also is a Baal.

We may, then, venture to sum up. In historical times we find certain phenomena which we group together under the name of ecstatic prophecy in many parts of the Mediterranean world. In every case we have been able to trace them back to the western coast-lands of Asia, and where our records go furthest these phenomena find their home in Syria. There they are connected in the first instance with that type of religion which we call Baalism. These features of religion gradually spread northwards, and when the earliest Greek records are available, they are well established in Asia Minor. On the way

they attach themselves to many deities—there were many Baals in Syria—and both gods and goddesses are involved. They then proceed westwards by three distinct routes. They are sometimes carried direct by the Phoenicians, as in the case of Cumae. They also cross the Aegean through the islands, in these cases being connected with the cult of Apollo, and no doubt absorbing the characteristics of numerous local deities on the way. The third movement is by land through Thrace, and this is associated with the cult of the vine—another of the features of the Syrian Baal. There are still later movements well within the age of exact history. These are all connected with the female side of the worship of Syria. The goddess Ishtar or Astarte has the same mantic elements as the god Baal, and these are handed on to the great goddess of Asia Minor, Aphrodite, Rhea or Dea Bona, and at the same time spread south into Egypt, where they become an integral part of the worship of Isis. And in the first century of the Roman Empire they are practically universal, yet they may all be traced back to the thought and religious practice of the race which had its home in the little strip of land which lies between the Mediterranean and the Syrian desert.

THEODORE H. ROBINSON.

CARDIFF.

## HESIOD, *WORKS AND DAYS*.

### AN ADDENDUM.

ON p. 118 I said (*à propos* of *W.D.* 742) that the injunction of Pythagoras *παρὰ θυσίαν μὴ ὀνυχίζου*, quoted by Goettling with a false reference, might be illuminating in its context but that I suspected it of being a figment. My suspicions were unfounded. The reference, as Mr. A. B. Cook has kindly pointed out to me, is *Iambl. Protrept.* 364 K.;<sup>1</sup> but Iamblichus's explanation—that 'nails' stands for one's remoter kinsfolk, *ὅσον ἀνεψιμάδαι ἢ πατραδέλφων γαμβροντιδεῖς ἢ τοιοῦτοί τινες*, with whom one should renew relations on festal days—does not seem very helpful.

Iamblichus also writes of Pythagoras: *Vit. Pyth.* 154, *παραγγέλλει δὲ ἐν ἑορτῇ μῆτε κείρασθαι μῆτε ὀνυχίζεσθαι, τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀξίειν τῶν ἀγαθῶν οὐχ ἡγούμενος δύναι τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἀπολείπειν ἀρχήν*, but the words convey no meaning to me.

A. S. F. GOW.

<sup>1</sup> Read, as one might suppose, *παρὰ θυσίαις*.

## DREAMS, THE SWELLING MOON, THE SUN.

1. THE etymologies susceptible to simple phonetic formulation and semantically obvious have, for the most part, been discovered long ago. But I cannot say semantically obvious without recording my conviction that semantic science is still in swaddling clothes. Readers of the *Classical Quarterly* will, I trust, find the following derivations interesting, as well as clear and semantically obvious.

i. *ὑπαρ* : *ὑπνος*.

2. If one adequately considers the context of *Odyssey* XIX. 547 he will realize that *ὑπαρ ἐσθλόν* was not a 'waking vision' but a 'good dream' (cf. Cicero, *de Div.* § 85), one that, coming before midnight through the gates of horn, was destined to come true. The other contexts subject to lexical control, and especially Aeschylus, *Prom.* 486, go to confirm the interpretation of *ὑπαρ* by 'somnia <uerum>', even though Virgil, *Aen.* III. 173, uses *sopor* to designate a dream that was not to come true, i.e. *δνap*. In one word, *ὑπαρ* = 'somnia, in bonam partem adhibitum.'

ii. *δνap* 'somnia falsum': Lat. *anima*.

3. The counterterm *δνap*—with Albanian and Armenian cognates that need no mention here—is from the root AN 'to breathe.' Cf. Lat. *anima* 'breath,' but also 'shade, wraith' (in the plural chiefly), and especially note the laying of the ghost of Polydorus in *Aen.* III. 67: '(animamque sepulcro | condimus).' So I interpret *δνap* by 'ghost,' the wraith of a dead man appearing in the dreams that come towards morn through the ivory gates.

4. As regards the *o* vocalism of *δνap* (: Cretan *ἀναπος ἀνap*), note the glosses *ὀμφή* · *πνοή*, *ὀνείρου φαντάσματα* (and in Homer *ὀμφή* was a dream voice or 'uox diuina') and *ὀμφα* · *ὀσμή* (cf. for the sense O. Bulg. *v-onja*<sup>1</sup> 'odor'), which have already been properly derived from the root AN (Lagercrantz in KZ. XXXV. 278). From an *s* extension of the root, as in O. Bulg. *achati* 'smell,' we have Lat. *umbræ* (<ONSRA-) 'Animal, Manes,' to which *umbra* 'shadow' is a secondary development due to the unsubstantiality (*inamitas*, see § 5) of the shadow. The *o* vowel is also found in *ὄνθος* 'dung,' named from its smell; *ἄνθος* 'flower,' also named from its 'odor.' Forms cited under *ὄνθος* for a root ODH have been assimilated with the sept of Lat. *odor* (§ 16).

5. Lat. *in-ānis*: Nearly forty years ago, without any semantic explanation at all, Fick ascribed *in-ānis* to the root AN (*BB.*, II., 175). He was entirely

<sup>1</sup> In *v-onja v-* is prosthetic, like the unwritten *v-* in Eng. *one*; *o* comes either from *o* or *a*.

right. We have the form-pattern in ἔν-ορχος 'testiculatus' ἔν-σπονδος 'foederatus,' like *in-ānis* 'aeratus' > 'having <nothing but> air.' A perfectly parallel development is found in ἀνεμώλιος 'inanis,' which I would by no means separate from its exact synonym μετ-α[νε]μόνιος (see for relation to sense of 'wind' Liddell and Scott), with loss of *ne* as in ἀμόνας 'ἀνεμόνας' (acc. pl.). The glosses μονιόν·μάταιον and μονή·ὀλιγορία will be false dis-composites from 'μετα-μόνιος.' Dissimilation of *ν ν* may account for λ in ἀνεμώλιος. See Liddell and Scott s.vv., and Capelle-Seiler on μεταμόνιος (cf. Homeric ἀνεμώλια | μεταμόνια βάζειν with 'uoces inanes fundere'). *Inanis* is quasi 'in-der-luftig.'

iii. Σελήνη 'sweller' > moon > shiner.

6. For the root (κ)SWEL 'tumere' see cognates in Walde, s.v. salum;<sup>1</sup> and for SWEL 'splendere' see Boisacq or Prellwitz s.v. σέλας. As the sequel will show (§§ 15-16) both roots are to be written (κ)SWEL (cf. also Solmsen ap. Boisacq l.c.). The two senses of the root κSWEL, to be studied further below, originated in the swelling or gibbous moon (cf. 'luna protumida'), and her swelling was 'splendor.'

iv. Lat. *īdūs*: Osc. *ēidu-*, Skr. *īndu-*.

7. A simpler illustration of the swelling moon is found in Lat. *īdūs* (n. pl.), the time of full or swollen moons: OLD in the sept of οἰδάνω (see Boisacq, s.v.; Berneker, *Slav. Etym. Wbch.*, p. 270). There is no sound reason, on the ground of the predominant vocalism of nominal and denominative forms, to deny to this root *e*-vocalism. The truth is that the root is to be written OLD | EID, with a grade form EID and, by secondary gradation, OD | EN (cf. the lexica on Lat. *seco* and Reichelt in KZ. XXXIX. 15 § 30; -75. § 171). For *eid* we have the testimony of Latin *aemīdus* (lexical only) which appears in one glossary as *aedīmus*. And this may be right, the transposition in *aemīdus* being suggested by *tumīdus*. Cf. also Lat. *aestus* 'tide, swell, billow,' for 'billow' seems more likely to have been transferred from water to fire than conversely. In Skr. *ēdhate* 'crescit, augetur; intumescit' the true diphthong is indeterminable, and *dh* for *d*, if not due to the synonymous Sanskrit roots

<sup>1</sup> Germ. *weile* and its cognates, gathered by Boisacq s.v. *eidōus*, are best ascribed to the root [s]WEL. The swell of the sea is living English to-day. With *salum*, to which *edōus* probably is cognate, the I.E. word for 'salt' is probably to be connected. The Greek, Latin, and Celtic forms have *ai* from *β* between vowels. In the other tongues *ai* is from *oi*, and the cognates are graded differently because they are differently suffixed (*sāl-d-*). It has not been observed before that Skr. *hṣārd-s* 'salty' is cognate with Lat. *sāl*, so that the root has to be written κSWEL, and the choice is open whether to define 'salt' from 'sea' (*salum*), or to define as 'burning, caustic,' as the lexica define *hṣard*s (derivationis causa). As regards the phonetics of the initial group κsw, which alternated with κsw (see examples in § 16), the derived tongues exhibit any two (but

*w/u* may not precede), or any one (see Walde, s.vv. *niēro dissipō*; P. Persson, *Beitr.* p. 997, in medio; Fay, *JAPA*. XLIV. 108 § 3; and, with particular bearing on the present article, Zupitza in BB. XXV. 93). Under these conditions the sept of κδλως (see Boisacq; Germ. *wölung* will come from [s]WEL-P. O. Pruss. *klup-stis* 'knee' will first have meant 'swelling,' and Baltic cognates meaning 'kneel, stumble, trot' (κδλπη) will be denominative thereto (pace Solmsen ap. Boisacq l.c.). Here also will belong σκδλος 'thigh, dick-bein' (in Homer 'ham'), named from its swelling, and Lat. *scelus* will have meant 'insolence' (cf. Walde s.v. *insolens*) to start with, as in fact Plautine *scelustus* means 'insolent.' Also κδλως 'urna' and its cognates will have been named from an original belly-ing shape.

*rāh*, causalis *vrāh*, may be ascribed to convergence of *d* and *dh* as root determinatives. The true diphthong is also indeterminable in Av. *aēda-* 'scalp,' from 'swell, bulge, crown.' I find the grade *ōd* in *σμ-ᾠδιξ* 'ge-schwulst' (*JAPA*. l.c.) and in Lettic *ada-* 'skin.'<sup>1</sup> For the compound root (κ)sw-ēid 'to exude,' etc. see *JAPA*. XLIV. 112 § 9.<sup>2</sup> It is of great importance to note (κ)sw-ēid also in the sept of Lat. *sīdus* quasi 'splendor' > constellation. In Lettic *swīdu*, 'dawn' the original sense may have been 'swelling' (cf. *αὐγή* 'light': Lat. *auget* 'swells, increases,' a third or fourth attestation for the group 'tumere > splendere'). Instead of being, as I supposed (op. cit.), the preposition *ksw-* 'co' the prius in the root (κ)sw-ēid 'to swell, shine' may have been from the root (κ)sāu (§ 16).

8. Excursus on Lat. *ovum* 'egg.' By the doctrine of root determinatives *d* and *dh* in *oid*: Skr. *edh* are additions to a simpler root *ōi*, attested in Lat. *ū-va* 'grape' and *ōa* 'sorb' (see Walde and Boisacq, s. vv). In *IF*. XVIII. 505 Lidew derives the names of a group of berries and berry-trees from a root *ag* 'tumere,' so *ōi-wa* in Lat. *ūva* will, in a sort, attest a root *ōi* with the sense of 'tumere.' With *oi|oidh* cf. *ei|eidh* 'ire' (see Brüggemann, *Gr*. II. 3, 374). From *ōi* 'tumere' we have Lat. *ō[t]-vom* 'egg' and its kin. In deriving nominal 'egg' from verbal 'swell' I follow a stereotyped pattern of thought (sunk to mere speech perhaps, a *cliché*). It were better, it may be, to begin with 'egg' and treat 'swell' as denominative. It is most important to observe that O. Bulg. *aje* 'egg' (see Berneker, l.c. p. 26) is best derived from *oi*, and never had a *v* suffix. The *ovum* 'sept' has no connection with the words for 'bird,' viz. Skr. *vis* 'the weaver' (: *vāyati*), while Lat. *avis* belongs with Skr. *ūti-s* 'web,' *ūti-s* 'woven': infin. *ō-tum*, from a root *ā-wē(1)*. It was from the bird that man learned wattle-and-daub, plaiting and weaving. There is no philological question whether the egg or the bird came first, and *ovum* is worthless to teach, what it has always been claimed to teach, IE. *vrddhi*.

9. Homeric *ιδνώθη: ιδνωθείς*: correctly derived by Fick in the third edition of his lexicon from *IDNO-* <'swollen, humped, bent, crooked'>. *ιδνωθείς* (*δ'*) *ὀπίσω* describes the posture of chest (or belly) out and shoulders back assumed by one repeatedly tossing a ball up in the air, also the backward 'swell' or 'lunge' of a serpent held in a bird's talon in his effort to bite the bird's chest.

10. *Ida*, mons: Prellwitz is also right in connecting *ιδη* (*ι < οι*) with the root of *οιδάνα*. Ovid (*Her*. V. 138) aptly illustrates by

in immensis qua tumet *Ida* iugis.

Or *ιδη* may have meant, in obsolete English, *surge* 'spring'; cf. the epithet

<sup>1</sup> Prellwitz properly derives *κύρος* 'anything that contains or covers' (Liddell and Scott) from the root *kv-ku* 'tumere,' in *kvō*; and Boisacq properly correlates *κύρος* and *ἐγ-κυρί* 'usque ad cutem' with Lat. *cutio*. On the *k-k* alternation see Hirt in *BB*. XXIV. 218 sq.; Weidemann,

*Lit. Gram.* § 43; Bartholomae in *Gr. Iran. Phil.* I. § 54; also Boisacq's article on *αράτω*.

<sup>2</sup> Thanks to the misfortune of having read *ē* instead of *ē* in Lith. *svėstas* 'butter' I denied its connection with Av. *svid* 'milk,' l.c. § 5.



πολυ-πίδαξ 'of many springs.' The sense of 'silva,' found first in Herodotus, will have come from the original sense of 'Hump, Bump' > hill > wooded hill. If it has  $d < l$  Lat. *silva* may have come from the compound root *sēw-ID*.

11. Ποτ-ειδάων (Corcyra): Fick is substantially right (I.<sup>4</sup> p. 359) in deriving the name of Poseidon from ΕΙΔ 'tumere.' If we do not disqualify (see Brugmann-Thumb, *Griech. Gram.* § 23. 1) the *F* of the Corcyrean inscription, -ειδάων is to be explained as a *wen* derivative from ΕΙΔΑ | ΙΔΑ 'swell, surge, billow,' cf. Skr. (and Avestan) divine names and epithets like *Maghdavan-*, *Āthar-van*, *ṛtā-van*. Accordingly, the vocative -ειδάων means 'undose.' The prius ποτ- is from a vocative \*ποτι 'domine' and the complex ποτι-ειδάων gave rise, after the fashion of Lat. *Jū-piter*, to the nominatives \*Ποσειδάων ( $\sigma < \dot{\iota}y$ ); but ποτι-ίδαων yielded \*Ποτιδαφών—with subsequent levellings as between τ[ι]σ and ε[ι]ϛ. In Ποτιδᾶς we may have a vocative -ΙΔ-*wes*, like Skr. *ṛtāvas*: *ṛtāvan-* or a weak stem nominative in *wṇ-s* (wṇ: *un*) in the Sanskrit weak stem *Maghon-* ( $o > au$ ). Cf. the weak stem nominatives to reduplicated, and a few other sporadic Sanskrit participles in *at*, Latin *-ens* (*gignens* but also *tegens*), out of -NT-s, a type possibly found in Greek ἀ-τρέμας 'non-tremens': ἀτρέμα[τ], originally masculine and neuter respectively.

12. Homeric ἰνδάλλεται 'scheint': As *F* is nowhere certified in this word it may be cognate with *idus* 'the swells' and then 'the brights' of the moon.

13. Vedic *Indu-*: In the Rīg Veda *Indu* is a manifestation of Soma, which is personified Liquor, and *Indu* is predominantly rendered by 'drop.' Now 'drop,' if one will think of the drops collecting beneath the wool strainer—not unlike architectural *guttae*—may well have meant 'sweller,' cf. lexical *induka-m* 'bulb' (of a certain plant). But *indu-* may have been a more surge-like manifestation. In RV. IX. 107, 12 it is said of Soma 'river-like he hath swelled with surge, with the stalk's juice' (Griffith); cf. also IX. 96, 8, 'As thoughtful Pavamāna urge, O Indu, speeding the kine, the plant's wave on to Indra'; and in VIII. 9, 19, 'when yellow stalks give forth their juice as cows from udders pour their milk,' where we think of swelling udders and spontaneous exudations of drops of milk from overfull teats or nipples. Mention may here be made that in φλέω φλώω and their kin the senses of 'swell' and 'flow, pour' are well attested.<sup>1</sup>

14. But *Indu* also meant the 'moon,' predominantly in the Brāhmaṇas, and also in RV. (cf. PW<sup>1</sup> and Monier-Williams, two decades after Grassmann

<sup>1</sup> This semantic observation leads to a simple etymology for Skr. *ksdrati* 'fundit, fluit' and finally 'evanescent,' a secondary sense development found also in the sept of *χλω* (cf. Lettic cognates in Prellwitz, s.v.). Thus *ksdrati* may come from the root *ks[w]el* 'tumere,' beside which stood a root (κ)σῶ 'tumere' (see § 16), whence Skr. *ksd-das* 'flood, swell': Av. *ksao-dah-*. By a sort of blending of Av. *ksas* 'tumere' with

*zav* 'fundere, fluere' (in *zao-tor* 'pouring-priest') we might expect a something like *γζav* ( $y\dot{z} = x\dot{z}$  sonantized). Now in the Iranian tongues neither *ksav* nor *zav* nor *γζav* are found in verb forms, but in place of *ksav*: Skr. *ksdrati* we do find *γζav* 'fundere, fluere.' As I shall show elsewhere the explanation of *ksdrati* as cognate with φέλω is mere bravura of algebraic phonetics.

as followed in PW<sup>2</sup>; see also Griffith or Ludwig in their versions of RV. VI. 39, 3). In the plural, *indavas* means moon-changes etc., i.e. Lat. '*idus*,' pretty nearly. To me, with my convictions of the permanence of ritual, Brāhmaṇic *Indu* 'moon' and Lat. *idūs* 'full-moons' must be near cognates (cf. Lat. *flāmen* = Skr. *brāhmaṇ*, as Kretschmer, *Einkl.* p. 128, rightly admits). But even if we define *Indu* by 'Drop' (in the sky), the sense of 'sweller' will inhere.

ἥλιος 'sun.'

15. Returning to the root (K)SWEL 'tumere' > 'splendere' (§ 6), I would express my skepsis about the derivation of ἥλιος from IE. (K)SĀW-EL- 'sun,' for ἥλιος seems to me no less likely to be derived from IE. AUSEL 'sun,' some grade of which is said to be borrowed into Etruscan as *usil* (see Walde, s.v. *Aurora*). This AUSEL is found in the Latin proper name *Ausilius*, cf. '<Aureliae familiae> publice a populo Romano datus sit locus quo sacra faceret Soli, qui ex hoc Ausēli dicebantur' (on ὅ cf. *Thes. LL.* II. 1482, 68 sqq. and especially the inscription—ante A.D. 200—'C. Aurilius [I= post-initial ē] C.f. prator'). Now the name *Ausilius* presents a perfect equation with Cretan ἀβελιος, cf. the glosses ἀβόος · ἐξ <ε>ω, ἀβώ πρωτ and ἀβώρ · ἥως (corrected from [βω] ἥως), all with ḍF from āu-s-. Even if *Ausilius* is Etruscan its *ausel-* will represent IE. AUSEL- before it was Tuscanized to *usil*. Certainly AUSEL and cognation of *Ausilius* with ἥλιος are as admissible as cognation of ἥλιος with Gothic *sauil* 'sun.'

16. IE. KSWEL 'tumere > splendere' is by no means impugned by the derivation of Goth. *sauil* from (h)sāw-el. We can admit a root (K)SĀU 'splendere, urere' in ὄ-λη (v) 'firing, firewood, wood' (cf. τὰ φρύγανα [: φρύγες 'roasts'] = 'firing > uirgulta,' then 'shrubs' as a class name; see *AJPh.* XXXIV. 26<sup>3</sup> for Skr. *ḍṣa-dhis* as 'fire-plant'), Skr. *savitár-* 'sun': Av. *hāvayeiti* 'roasts,' but Skr. *kṣā[ū]yati*<sup>1</sup> 'burns,' cf. Syracus, *σαν-κόν* · ξηρόν (*kṣāyati*). The extension (K)SĀU-s is found in Av. *haosmna-* 'exarescens' (cf. σκᾶλλει 'arefacit,' from SK[W]EL); see cognates in Boisacq s.v. *aōos*, Walde s.v. *sāduis* (which is possibly directly from KST-DO-). But there is equal evidence for (K)SĀU 'tumere' in *σαῦλος* 'swell, swagger, dainty' etc.; *σαυρή* 'pars t u m i d a,' in mal. part., cf. ON. *eista* 'testiculus' (? : *ἀδὴν* 'swollen gland,' root *διδ*, § 7); *σαυρωτήρ* 'stickprong' jutting from a spear; *σαυρή* 'lizard' (cf. *Encyc. Brit.* s.v. *chamaeleon* for the swelling out of the chest and body of that species). Also of record are *σαύνιον* | *σαννίον* which Cratinus used for 'membrum uirile,' but Menander, reversing the common equivoque, exhibited in Plautine *machæra* e.g., uses *σαύνιον* as 'javelin.' Further, Hesychius defines *σαννιον* by *σαθρόν*, i.e. 'putrid,' sequel sense to the sense of 'snelling,' and he also has *σαννά* · ἀπαλά, i.e. 'soft,' again a sequel sense to 'rotten.' For this last group of words, though Zupitza did not trouble himself about their root meaning, the reader may also consult Zupitza in *BB.* XXV. 93 to advantage. For the sense of 'rotten' further note Lettic *idra* (: *oid*), the

<sup>1</sup> In Av. *sāis-dant-* 'splendidus' the prius is an instrumental from KSA-T- 'splendor,' reduced—

perhaps in composition, say with *hu-* 'bene' or *duš-* 'male'—to the absolute null grade.

rotten pith of a tree (see Berneker, l.c. 271). I also suspect, if I may again throw back to  $\delta\text{ID}$  'tumere,' that, out of the derivatives of  $\delta\text{ID}$ , the sept of Lat. *odor* 'smell' grew up, viz. from the putrefaction that so often accompanies swelling. On the vocalism see § 7. The sept of Lat. *odit* 'hates' will have arisen very simply from  $\delta\text{ID}$  'tumere,' cf. e.g. Homeric  $\chi\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  οἱ δ' ἀνεῖ νόον = *ira tu me facit animum*, also the definition of *tumeo tumesco turgesco* in the lexica. Cf. Homeric  $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\sigma\text{-}\acute{\omega}\delta\eta\varsigma$  'ira-tumescens'; but, with Wackernagel (pace Fay, *JAPA*. XLIV. 112 § 9), in  $\theta\upsilon\text{-}\acute{\omega}\delta\eta\varsigma$  and  $\kappa\eta\acute{\omega}\delta\eta\varsigma$  the posterius  $\text{-}\acute{\omega}\delta\eta\varsigma$  'fragrans.' For Homer this is all, excluding a proper name. This double value of  $\text{-}\acute{\omega}\delta\eta\varsigma$  made it available for its wide development as a suffix, = 'ful.'

#### Latin *sol*.

17. The 'authoritative' primate for *sol* is  $\text{s}\bar{\text{a}}\text{w}\text{-EL}$  (in Goth. *sauil*). This assumes that WE yielded Latin *vo* and then *o*—followed by contraction of *ao* to *o*, so early that no trace of hiatus remains. Others (e.g. Reichelt in *KZ*. XXXIX. 67) operate with  $\text{s}\bar{\text{a}}\text{UL}$ - in Lith. *saulė*, in which case again Latin *o* is a guess *ad hoc*. We all feel a strong impulse, I suppose, to unitary paradigms, but IE. metaplasts are no less likely. So it may be just as well to explain Lat. *sol* 'shiner' as a long grade root noun (κ)swōL (Cf. κλάψ : κλέπτω), cognate with O. Eng. *swōl* 'sultry' (: Goth. \*swōls) *swōlus*, see Kluge, s.v. *schwul*. As long as  $\text{s}\bar{\text{a}}\text{WEL}$  meant 'shining' as well as 'sun,' any form of *KSWEL* that meant 'shining' was likely also to be used for 'sun.'

EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

### LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

**Berliner philologische Wochenschrift.** 1917.

[Only the following numbers have reached us.]

Jan. 6. H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones latinae selectae* (G. Wissowa). Vol. III., Pars II., completing the work. A large and trustworthy selection, with brief notes and useful Indices. A. Adler, (1) *Catalogue supplémentaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibl. R. de Copenhague. Avec (2) un extrait du Catalogue des manuscrits grecs de l'Escorial redigé par D. G. Moldenhawer* (Gardthausen). (1) supplements the Catalogue of Graux; (2) is more important. It contains selections from a full and trustworthy Catalogue made in 1784, but never printed, and supplements the faulty Catalogue of E. Miller. M. Hörnes, *Urgeschichte der bildenden Kunst in Europa von den Anfängen bis um 500 v. Chr.* (Anthes). Second edition, in which the literature of the last twenty years is taken into account. 1,330 illustrations. L. Radermacher contributes to this number a note on Soph. *At.* 434 sqq., in which he shows by reference to certain inscriptions that *καλλιτεία* means not 'prize for beauty,' but 'that which is fairest,' in this case Hesione; the Schol. says *εἴληφε τὴν Ἡσιόνην παρὰ τοῦ Ἡρακλείου*. R. compares Eur. *Phoen.* 214 sq. (*καλλιτεῖματα*) and Iph. *Taur.* 20 sqq. *τὸ καλλιτεῖον*.

Apr. 28. A. Roemer, *Aristarchs Athetesen in der Homerkritik (wirkliche und angebliche)* (Cauer). Part of a long review in which C. discusses the subject in detail.

May 26. E. Levy, *Privatstrafe und Schadensersatz im klassischen römischen Recht* (Kübler).

June 2. *Eranos. Acta philologica Suecana.* Vol. XV. (Heraeus). The reviewer gives a summary of the papers.

June 16. Fr. Blass, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch.* 4th ed. by A. Debrunner, 1913 (Hermann). The reviser has done his work with knowledge and skill, and has much increased the usefulness of the book. F. Vollmer, *Quinti Sereni liber medicinalis*, ed. F. V. (Kind). The apparatus criticus is thorough, and references are added to 'auctores, imitatores, and testes.' There are full indices. J. Sieveking, *Die Terrakotten der Sammlung Loeb.* With introduction by James Loeb. I. Bd. (Pagenstecher). Very highly praised. The second volume will complete the work.

June 23. J. Geffcken, *Griechische Epigramme* (Mesk). Four hundred pieces well chosen to illustrate the development of the epigram from the seventh century B.C. to the fifth A.D. Brief notes give references to the latest literature on the subject. G.'s 'Studien zum griech. Epigramm' in *Neue Jahrb. XX.* (1917), 1 Abt. pp. 88-117 will serve as an Introduction to this selection.

June 30. J. H. Lipsius, *Cratippi Hellenicorum fragmenta Oxyrhynchia*, ed. J. H. L. (Gelzer). One of Lietzmann's *Kleine Texte*. The reviewer gives a list of the more important changes in the text. E. Drerup, *Aus einer alten Advokatenrepublik. (Demosthenes und seine Zeit.)* (Ammon). The book does not gain by the

introduction of modern politics, the comparison of Demosthenes with certain Entente statesmen, etc.; its permanent value lies in the discussion of many difficult problems of Greek history. F. Preisigke, *Antikes Leben nach den ägyptischen Papyri* (Gelzer). A volume in the series 'Aus Natur und Geisteswelt.' Useful to the teacher of history or of language.

# Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. I. 1916.

J. B. Carter, *The reorganization of the Roman Priesthoods at the beginning of the Republic*. C. discusses the loss of the political power of the *Rex* and the gradual limitation of his office to the performance of priestly functions. E. K. Rand and G. Howe, *The Vatican Livy and the script of Tours*. Fourteen plates give specimens of the handwriting of the eight scribes. The writers assign the Livy to the period before the arrival of Alcuin at Tours. A. W. van Buren (in collaboration with S. P. Stevens), *The Aqua Traiana and the mills on the Ianiculum*. Describes that part of Aqueduct which exists below the new buildings of the American Academy and the mills in the neighbourhood, which were probably run by water-power from the Aqueduct. C. D. Curtis, *Ancient granulated jewellery of the seventh century B.C.* Gold jewellery ornamented with granulations, dating from Egypt about 2000 B.C., and also in the eastern Mediterranean, attained its highest excellence in Etruria in the eighth or seventh century B.C. J. R. Crawford, *Capita Desecta and marble coiffures*. E. S. McCartney, *The military indebtedness of early Rome to Etruria*. The primitive Latin warrior was first and foremost a spearsman, using also a shield. Later, having to withstand the Etruscans who were practised in the use of bronze, he adopted their methods. Roman camps may very possibly be derived from Terramare, either directly or through Etruria.

# Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica. XLV. 3. July, 1917.

F. Garin, *The 'Scholia Vetera in Theocriti Idyllia' in Codex Estensis Gr. 87*. This fourteenth-century MS. belongs to the class called by Wendel the *genus Vaticanum*, but seems to be derived from an original less corrupt than that of U. A. and E. and preserves readings superior to theirs. It contains the Scholia to *Idylls* I.-XVIII. and the arguments to *Idylls* XIII. and XVI.-XVIII. A list of the more important readings is given. V. Costanzi, *The legal status of Greece after the destruction of Corinth in 146 B.C.* After examining the view of Colin, that Greece was neither formed into a province nor subjected to tribute on its conquest in 146 B.C., and that of Cardinali who, admitting its formation into a province, holds that it was exempted from tribute till the time of the Mithridatic wars, C. concludes that a tribute was imposed (with, however, the usual exception in favour of federate and free states, which will sufficiently explain such references to the 'freedom' of Greece as Appian, *Mithrid.* 58. and Caesar *B.C.* III. 3), and that if not formally constituted a province the country was yet administered exactly like one, except that it depended on the governor of Macedonia and did not obtain a separate governor till circa 27 B.C. P. Rasi, *A recently discovered Christian inscription and a restoration of a Pompeian Graffito*. (1) Discusses the metre of an inscription published in the *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1916, fasc. 4, which runs 'Hic Optata sita est quam tertia rapuit aestas lingua manu nunquam dulcor ulla fuit in pace. (2) Argues for the reading 'formae' against the 'forma' suggested by Della Corte (*Notizie*, 1916, fasc. 8) in the graffito, 'sic tibi contingat semper florere, Sabina, Contingat formae, sisque puella diu,' originally published in *Notizie*, 1910. A. Beltrami, *The epigram in honour of the painter M. Plautius* (Plin. *N.H.* XXXV. 115). Contests the reading 'Dignis digna loco. Picturis condecoravit' proposed by Stampini in *Rivista* XLII., p. 593, and proposes 'Dignis dignus loco picturis condecoravit.'

**Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie.** 1917.

Mar. 26. Percy Gardner, *The Principles of Greek Art* (Ulrichs). Compact and practical in form, and generally concise and clear in content. M. Grabmann, *Forschungen über die lateinischen Aristotelesübersetzungen des XIII. Jahrhunderts* (Busse). Deserves recognition.

Mar. 26 and Ap. 2. G. Andresen, *Taciti libri qui supersunt*, rec. C. Halm. Ed. V. vol. ii. cur. G. A. (John). The new edition deserves to be accepted as the basis of the text of Tacitus for many years to come.

Ap. 9 and 16. W. Streitberg, *Geschichte der indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft* II. 1 (Wagner). The undertaking has made a brilliant beginning, which raises the highest expectations.

Ap. 23. W. Sauppe, *Die Anfangsstadien der griechischen Kunstprosa* (Drerup). Unsatisfactory. [A favourable review of the same work by Mutschmann appears on May 21.] G. T. Kazarow, *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte der Thraker* (Lamer). An attractive and instructive work.

Ap. 30. G. Roesch, *Altattümliche Marmorwerke von Paros* (Ulrichs). Full of suggestiveness outside the range of the special subject.

May 7. W. Sternkopf, *Ciceros ausgewählte Reden*, erkl. v. K. Halm. III. *Die Reden gegen Catilina und für den Dichter Archias*. 15 ed. by W. S. The new edition is so extensively revised that it ranks as an independent work. Harry Torczyner, *Die Entstehung des semitischen Sprachtypus* (Wagner). I. The contents are important.

May 14. M. Tangl, *Die Briefe des h. Bonifatius u. Lullus* (C. W.). A successful edition.

May 21 and 28. †A. Holder, *Die Reichenauer Handschriften*. III. 1 (Preisendanz). Left as a fragment by Holder's death, but useful and important. Every page gives evidence of marvellous learning.

May 28 (double number). N. Wecklein, *Ausführlicher Kommentar zu Sophokles Philoktet* (Draheim). Accurate and well expressed. E. H. Sturtevant, *Labial Terminations* (Wagner).

June 11. L. Radermacher, *Sophokles Trachinierinnen*, erkl. v. Schneidewin-Nauck. Seventh ed. by L. R. (Draheim). Praised. F. Lesser, *Vocabularium jurisprudentiae Romanae*. IV. 1 (*nam-numen*). Ed. F. L. (Kalb). The new editor seems to be fully competent for his task.

June 18. K. Brugmann, *Vergleichende Laut- Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre* (Güntert). Completes B.'s encyclopaedic and indispensable work.

July 2. J. Sieveking, *Die Terrakotten der Sammlung Loeb*, published by J. S., with Introduction by J. Loeb. 2 vols. (Bulle). The publication is of extraordinary beauty.

July 9. K. Sethe, *Von Zahlen und Zahlworten bei den alten Ägyptern* (Roscher). Highly instructive. J. Wackernagel, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* (Drerup). The reviewer recognizes that the book contains much valuable detailed work, but raises fundamental objections both to the author's premisses and to his results. Lisa Hamburg, *Observationes hermeneuticae in urnas Etruscas* (Lamer). The reviewer rejects the artistic theories.

**CORRECTIONS.**

In the Note on p. 135 and in Note 2 on p. 156, for 'Journal of Philology' read 'Classical Philology.'

The Notes by Professor Jean Wageningen on pp. 131, 140 should be deleted. They appear in the *Classical Quarterly* for July, 1912.

# INDICES

## I.—GENERAL INDEX.

### A.

- ABBREVIATION-SYMBOLS, Roman, 38 ff.  
 Abstrusa Glossary and *Liber Glossarum*, the, 119 ff.  
 Adnotanda in Latin prosody, 169 ff.  
 Aeneas, character of, 19 f.  
 Aeschylus' *Euменides*, etc., 141 ff.  
 Affatim Glossary, the, and others, 185 ff.  
 Agamemnon, the kingship of, 146 ff.  
 Anaxagoras, on the date of the trial of, 81 ff.  
   his relations with Pericles, 83  
   with Socrates, 83 f.  
   founder of philosophical schools in Asia Minor, 86 f.  
 'ancient Notae' and Latin texts, 38 ff.  
 Anderson (W. B.), notes on Lucan and Seneca's *Letters*, 98 ff.  
 'animula uagula blandula,' 166  
 Apollo as a Baal, 206 ff.  
 assimilatory changes in word-groups, 161  
 Attalus II. of Pergamum, 2

### B.

- Baal in Hellas, 201 ff.  
*Bacchae*, phenomena of 'ecstasy' in the, 208 ff.

### C.

- Caesar's *lex frumentaria*, 27 ff.  
 Carmenta, 206  
 Cassandra, the 'ecstasy' of, 207  
 Catullus, note on, 136  
 chronology of reigns of the Caesars, 163  
 'clauses belonging to future time,' 65 ff.  
*Codex Agemensis*, the, and Valla, 154 ff.  
*Codex Cantabrigiensis* of Livy, 69 ff.  
*Codex Estensis* of Theocritus, 219  
 Cossutia, 161 f.  
*Culex*, Lucan's allusion to the, 106  
*Cynthia* poems of Propertius, the, 103 f.

### D.

- Deiphobus, 21  
 Delphic Oracle, the, and Greek colonization, 161  
 'determined futurity' in Greek, 163  
 Dido, the suicide of, 23 ff.  
 diminution, Latin, of adjectives, 109

- Dionysus as a Baal, 210  
 Domitian, character of, 54  
 Donatus, a ninth-century commentary on, 94 ff.  
 dreams, the swelling moon, the sun, 212 ff.  
 Dunbabin (R. L.), notes on Latin poets, 135 ff.  
   notes on Seneca, *Epistulae Morales*, 173 ff.

### E.

- Ennius, 'cantor Euphorionis,' 164  
 Esposito (M.), a ninth-century commentary on Donatus, 94 ff.  
 Evelyn-White (Hugh G.), note on *Papiri Greci e Latini* (No. 131), 50 f.

### F.

- Fates, the, the gods, and the freedom of man's will in the *Aeneid*, 11 ff.  
 Fay (Edwin W.), dreams, the swelling moon, the sun, 212 ff.  
   syntax and etymology: the impersonals of emotion, 88 ff.  
 Festus excerpts in the Philoxenus and Abolita glossaries, 185 ff.  
 free-will, how represented in the *Aeneid*, 19 ff.  
 Furius Bibaculus, 161

### G.

- Gallipoli, inscription at, 1 f.  
 Garrod (H. W.), Rejoinder (to Professor Housman on the *Thyestes* of Varius), 48 f.  
 glossaries, the Affatim and others, 185 ff.  
 gods, their relation to the Fates in the *Aeneid*, 14 ff.  
 Gow (A. S. F.), miscellaneous notes on the *Works and Days*, 113 ff., 211  
 Greek tragedy, some passages of, 57 ff.

### H.

- Hardy (E. G.), the *professions* of the Heracleian Table, 27 ff.  
 Harmodius and Aristogeiton, 164  
 Heracleitus, a fragment of, 165  
 Hesiod: miscellaneous notes on the *Works and Days*, 113 ff.  
   *Works and Days*, an addendum, 211  
 Homer, note on, 49  
 homicide, Greek conception of effects of, 64



Horace, notes on, 137 ff.  
Housman (A. E.), the *Thyestes* of Varius, 42 ff.

## I.

*Iliad*, Schol. A. to the, 145  
impersonals of emotion, 88  
Indo-European nominal stem-suffixes, 107  
*indu* (Vedic), meanings of, 215 f.  
inscription at Gallipoli, 1 f.  
Ithaca, 53, 162

## J.

Jones (H. L.), notes on Strabo, 132 ff.  
Jones, Sergt.-Major R. S., 1 f.  
Jupiter, his relation to the Fates in the *Aeneid*, 16 f.  
Justin, date of his work, 161

## K.

Lang, Andrew, 146 f.  
Latin diminution of adjectives, 109, 161  
poets, notes on, 135 ff.  
subjunctive, the, 162  
Latinus, 20  
*lex frumentaria* of Caesar, 27 ff.  
*lex Julia Municipalis*, 33  
Lindsay (W. M.), 'ancient Notae' and Latin texts, 38 ff.

the *Abstrusa Glossary* and the *Liber Glossarum*, 119 ff.  
the *Affatim Glossary* and others, 185  
LITERATURE AND GENERAL: SUMMARIES OF  
PERIODICALS, 52 ff., 107 ff., 161 ff., 218 ff.  
(see further under 'Summaries')  
Livy, the *Codex Cantabrigiensis* of, 69 ff.  
Lucan, notes on, 98 ff.  
Lucretius, notes on, 135 f.  
Lygdamus, was he Seruius Sulpicius? 164 f.

## M.

Martial, note on, 140  
Matthaei (L. E.), the Fates, the gods, and the freedom of man's will in the *Aeneid*, 11 ff.

## N.

Natalis Comes, 164  
Norwood (Gilbert), inscription at Gallipoli, 1 f.

## P.

painting, references to, in Plautus and Terence, 162  
Palatine Library of Apollo, the, 104 f.  
Pallis (Alex.), note on Homer, 49  
note on Sophocles, 49  
*Papiri Grati & Latine* (No. 131), note on, 50 f.  
paring the nails, ancient taboos respecting, 118  
Pearson (A. C.), some passages of Greek tragedy, 57 ff.  
Petrarch, the *Secretum* of, 166  
Philargyrius, 45  
Phillimore (J. S.), Statius and the date of the *Culex*, 106  
Plato's reply to Polycrates' speech against Socrates, 165

Politian, a MS. in the writing of, 167  
Porter (W. H.), on some passages in the *Rhesus*, 159 f.  
Poseidon, derivation of the name, 215  
Postgate (J. F.), adnotanda in Latin prosody, 169 ff.  
Powell (J. U.), Aeschylus' *Euменides*, etc., 141 ff.  
*professions* of the Heracleian Table, the, 27 ff.  
Propertius and the *Aeneid*, 103 ff.  
prophets, functions of the Hebrew and other Syrian, 202 ff.  
'prophetic ecstasy,' the phenomena of, 203 ff.  
prosody, Latin, adnotanda in, 169 ff.  
'prospective optatives,' 67  
Pytheas of Massilia, 165

## R.

*recensus populi*, 28 ff.  
*Rhesus*, on some passages in the, 159 f. (see pp. 57 ff.)  
Rice-Holmes, on a criticism of his explanation of *B.G.* iv. 28 (2 sq.), 162  
Richmond (O. L.), Propertius and the *Aeneid*, 103 ff.  
Robinson (Theodore H.), Baal in Hellas, 201 ff.

## S.

sacred persons, three types of, in Semitic religion, 202  
Samuel, a 'seer,' not a 'prophet,' 202  
Scira and Scirophoria, the, 54  
Sedulius of Liège, 94 ff.  
Semitic religions, distinctive features of, 201 f.  
Seneca, *Epistulae Morales*, notes on, 102, 179 ff.  
Sheppard (J. T.), *ῥήματα, κήρυξ*, and the modest measure in three plays of Euripides, 3 ff.  
Shewan (A.), the kingship of Agamemnon, 146 ff.  
Sophocles, note on, 49  
Statius and the date of the *Culex*, 106 (see Vol. X., No. 4)  
stem-suffixes, Indo-European nominal, 107  
Strabo, notes on, 132 ff.  
suicide, the Stoic and Virgilian view of, 23 f.  
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 52 ff., 107 ff., 161 ff., 218 ff.  
American Journal of Philology, 107, 161  
Berliner philologische Wochenschrift, 52 f., 107 f., 218 f.  
Classical Philology, 161 f.  
Classical Weekly, 53, 109 f., 162 f.  
Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 54, 110 f., 163 f.  
Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen, 111  
Hermes, 111 f.  
Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, 219  
Mnemosyne, 54 f., 164 f.  
Revue de Philologie, 55, 112, 165 f.  
Rheinisches Museum, 55, 166  
Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica, 112, 166 f., 219  
Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie, 55 f., 167 f., 220

Sybil, Semitic connections of the name, 206  
syntax and etymology: the impersonals of  
emotion, 88 ff.

T.

taboos, ancient, 118  
Taylor (A. E.), on the date of the trial of  
Anaxagoras, 81 ff.  
Telephus, 59  
Terence, the *Hecyra* of, 55  
Thebes, Phoenician influence at, 208  
*Thyestes* of Varius, the, 42 ff. (see Vol. X., pp.  
206 ff.)  
Tibullus, the Brescian codex of, 166 f.  
Trogus, 161  
*τύπαινος, μέτρος*, and the modest measure in  
three plays of Euripides, 3 ff.

V.

Valla and the *Codex Agemensis*, 154 ff.  
Varius, the *Thyestes* of, 42 ff.

Varus and Varius, 42 ff.  
Virgil, dates of Propertius' references to, 104 f.  
note on, 136 f.  
Virgil's conception of the Fates, the gods, and  
human free will, 11 ff.  
vocatives as first elements in compounds, 161

W.

Walters (C. F.), the *Codex Agemensis* and Valla,  
154 ff.  
waxen vessels, 133  
White (Hugh G. Evelyn), note on *Papiri Greci e  
Latini* (No. 131), 50 f.  
Whitehead (Florence), *Codex Cantabrigiensis* of  
Livy, 69 ff.  
*Works and Days*, miscellaneous notes on the,  
113 ff.

Z.

Zomino of Pistoia, 167

## II.—INDEX LOCORVM.

- A.
- Aeschylus:—  
*Ag.* (1072 sqq.) 206 f.  
*Eum.* (231) 141 f., (334 sq.) 144 f., (343) 142 f., (500) 143 f.  
Appendix Vergiliana:—  
*Catalepton* 10 (6 sqq.) 171
- Appian:—  
ii. (102) 30
- Apuleius:—  
viii. (24 sqq.) 204
- Aristophanes:—  
*Lys.* (661) 49
- Aristotle:—  
*Metaph.* (1093a) 109
- C.
- Caesar:—  
*Bell. Gall.* iii. 12 (1) 107; iv. 28 (2 sq.) 162
- Catullus:—  
xcii. 3 (*coll. Plaut. Persid.* 362; *Plut. Quasst. Conuiv.* viii. 726b) 136
- Cicero:—  
*ad Att.* i. 16 (13) 32; xiii. 33 (1) 32  
*ad fam.* vi. (18) 32; xvi. 23 (1) 32  
*Nat. De.* i. (49) 111  
*Tusc. Disp.* iii. 19 (45) 164
- D.
- Dio Cassius:—  
38 (13, 1) 35; 42 (21, 6) 30; 43 (25, 5) 30
- Diogenes Laertius:—  
ii. (7) 81
- E.
- Euripides:—  
*Heracleidas* (111, 181, 361) 3, (423) 4, (533, 597, 745, 863) 5, (883) 4, (1043) 5  
*Medea* (311, 348, 453, 458, 597) 8, (536, 592, 599, 627, 698) 9, (778, 877, 932, 957, 965 sqq., 1228) 10, (1298) 8  
*Rhes.* (161 sqq.) 57 f., (250 sqq.) 58 f., 159, (340 sqq.) 60, 159 f., (702 sq., 720 sq.) 160, (789 coll. Eustath. *Od.* p. 1965, 49) 60 f., (811, 859 sqq.) 160  
*Suppl.* (153 sqq.) 5 f., (384, 1189) 7
- F.
- Festus:—  
(p. 263) 177
- H.
- Heracleitus:—  
*fr.* 100 (Bywater) 165
- Herulanum Papyrus (No. 1670) 167
- Herodotus:—  
vi. (106) 63
- Hesiod:—  
*Works and Days* (18 sq., 202, 267, 314) 113, (416, 430, 436) 114 f., (442, 479 sqq., 602, 628) 116 f., (643, 727 sqq.) 117 f., (742, 753) 118
- Homer:—  
*Il.* i. (40, 66, 78, 315) 49; xviii. (481), *ib.*: xxii. (29), 145; *Od.* v. (240 coll. *Il.* x. 188) 68
- Horace:—  
*Odes* i. 6 (1, 2, 8) 42  
*Sat.* i. 10 (19) 161, (20 sqq.) 137, (43 sq.) 42 f.; 8 (31 sq.) 139
- I.
- Iamblichus:—  
*Protrept.* 364 (x) 211  
*Vit. Pythag.* (154) 211
- L.
- Lucius Pisonis (237 sqq.) 45
- Livy:—  
i. (7) 206  
*Epit.* (115) 30
- Lucan:—  
iii. (186) 98; v. (190 sqq.) 98, (523 sqq.) 98 f., (552) 99 f., (792 sqq.) 100 f.; ix. (720) 171
- Lucilius:—  
*ap. Nov.* 65 (29) 171
- Lucretius:—  
i. (469 sqq.) 133, (566 sqq.) 134; iii. (1042) 173 f.; v. (485, 880 sq., 1442) 167
- M.
- Martial:—  
iv. 37 (9) 140; viii. (45) 165
- Martianus Capella:—  
iii. (296) 176
- Mon. Anc. iii. 14, 22 (f. 16) 31
- N.
- New Testament:—  
*St. Mark* ix. (40) 165
- O.
- Old Testament:—  
*Jeremiah* iv. (23 sqq.) 204; xxix. (26) 203  
*Kings* i. xviii. (20 sqq.) 204; xxii. (11) 203; ii. iii. (13) 203; ix. (11) 203

Ovid:—

*Metam.* vi. (200 sqq.) 106

*Oxyrh. Papyri* iii. 413 (94) 145

P.

*Papiri Graeci & Latini*, No. 131 (2 sqq. coll. Pind.

*Ol.* vi. 14) 50 f.

Pindar:—

*Pyth.* xi. (55) 112

Plato:—

*Gorg.* (521b) 59

*Theaet.* (209b) 58 f.

Plautus:—

*Cas.* (414) 175

*Curv.* (220, 236, 244) 175

*Merc.* (124) 175

*Rudens* (93) 170

*Trin.* (685) 169

Pliny the Elder:—

*N.H.* xxxv. (115) 219

Pliny the Younger:—

*Epp.* vii. 27 (12) 171

Plutarch:—

*Caes.* (55) 30

*Pericl.* (32) 82

Priscian:—

ii. p. 165, 11 sqq. (Keil) 172

Q.

Quintilian:—

*Inst. Or.* ix. 3 (8) 167

S.

Seneca:—

*Epp. Mor.* 12 (7) 102, 15 (9), 29 (2) 179, 33

(9) 180, 40 (1, 2, 9, 10) 181, 42 (4) 181,

47 (10), 76 (5), 78 (21), 80 (1), 82 (24) 182,

83 (5) 106, 86 (10), 87 (9) 183, 88 (9) 184,

107 (10) 102, 122 (1) 102

Serenus Sammonicus:—

*Liber Medicinalis* (402, 414, 425) 175

Silius:—

xiii. (166) 174

Sophocles:—

*Ajax* (434 sqq.) 218, (637) 65, (869 coll. 769 ;

*Thuc.* v. 111 ; *Soph. fr.* 210, 40) 61

*Antig.* (773) 65

*El.* (913 sq. coll. Eur. *Herac.* 1004) 68

*O.C.* (190, 405) 65, (569 sq.) 61

*O.T.* (216 sqq.) 62 ff.

*Trach.* (11) 49, (903) 67

Strabo:—

ii. 1 (36) 133 f. ; iii. 3 (6 sq.) 132 f.

Suetonius:—

*Aug.* (40) 31

*Jul.* (41) 27, (42) 31

T.

Tacitus:—

*Agric.* 44 (1) 162

*Ann.* iv. (7) 106

Terence:—

*Haut.* (102, 424, 834) 169

*Heu.* (148) 169

*Phorm.* (182, 569) 169

Tibullus:—

i. 4 (27) 174, 5 (3) 177

V.

Varro:—

*L.L.* 5 (21) 177

Virgil:—

*Aen.* i. (239) 12 ; ii. (432 sqq.) 19 ; iii. (375)

17, (494) 12 ; iv. (519) 18, (696) 25 ; v. (706)

18, (709) 20 ; vi. (46 sqq.) 206 ; vii. (224,

294) 12, (313 sqq.) 15 ; viii. (334) 19 ; ix.

(133) 12 ; x. (35, 154) 12 ; xi. (160) 12 ;

xii. (725 sqq.) 12 f., 18, (952) 13

*Ecl.* iv. (62) 167

*Georg.* i. (266 coll. Pliny *N.H.* xvi. 180 ;

xvii. 96) 136 f. ; ii. (95, 413) 165

### III.—INDEX VERBORVM.

#### A.—GREEK.

ἀσμεῶντος, 213	A.	δμφα, δμφή, 212	
αἰεῖν = παραιεῖσθαι, 117		δναρ, 212	
αἶνοι, 113		δνυχίεσθαι, 211	
Ἀλκαῖρα, 145		οὐνεκα (Trag.), 60, 159	
ἀνάσσειν, 148			II.
γυή, 113	Γ.	πεινή, 89	
δαίμων, 114		Ποσειδών, 215	
(?) δαλερός, 143	Δ.	πρός, 'in the direction of,' 58	
διαταῖος, 144		προσκειῖσθαι, 57	
ἐγρεθα (subj.), 113	E.	σαννά, σανρίον, 216	Σ.
ἐνέρχῃ, 49		σαυρή, σαυρωτήρ, 216	
ἐπίσκηψις, 109		Σελήνη, 'sweller,' 213	
ἥδιος, 216	H.	Σκίρον, 54	
ἱδυθής, ἱδυόθη, 214	I.	στέλλειν, στολίζειν, 116 f.	
ἰσάλλεσθαι, 215		σύβολον, 62	
καλλιστεία, 218	K.	συνέλειν, 166	
Κλινται-μήστρα, 161			T.
κραταί-τους, 161		τὸ γιγνόμενον, 165	
κρατεῖν, 4		τόραντος, 3 ff.	
κυνηγέττειν, 141			T.
μαινά, 143 f.	M.	δπαρ, δπρος, 212	
μέρος τοῦ λόγου, 162		δπατος θεῶν, 160	
μή, μή οὐ, with participle, 63			Φ.
μονοσιτίω, μονοτροφέω, 132		φρενοδαής, 143	
Μυσῶν ἑσχατοί, 58 f.		φρενοδαής, 143 f.	
μυχθισμῶς νεκρῶν, 60 f.		χάρις, 57	X.
		χρῶς, 114 f.	
οἶος, with infin., 114	O.	ψυχρότης, 161	Ψ.
ὀλιγομερία, πολυμερία, 162		ώδης, 217	Ω.
		Ὀκεανός, 55	

#### B.—LATIN.

abies, abiit, etc., 172 ff.	A.	bacarium, 187	B.
aeidimus, aemidus, 213		blenni, 187	
ancil, 125		bomus lucas, 187	
Anien, 175			C.
atta, 187		cotidianus, 140	
attodisse (attudisse ?), 171		diu, 170	D.
Aurelius, 216		diutinus, 170	

*diutius*, scansion of, 169 f.

*diuturnus*, 170

*doleo, mi dolet*, 90

E.

(?) *eo* (Oscan), 112

*exsilio*, 102

F.

*Fabarius* (?), 52

*frigidum*, 160

*fulmen*, 165

H.

*hora* (Caes.), 107

I.

*Ida* (mons), 214

*idas* (n. pl.), 213

*inans*, 212 f.

*ingerum*, 115 f.

K.

*kurw* (Oscan), 'round,' 112

L.

*lien*, 175 f.

*lustrum condere*, 55

M.

*melimela*, 139

N.

*natrux*, 'watersnake,' 171 f.

-*ne*, uses of, 137 f.

*nec = et nom*, 98

*edit*, 217

*odor*, 217

*ovum*, 214

O.

P.

*parmitet*, 89 f.

*parcepromus*, 112

*penuria*, 89

*pollen, pollis*, 177 f.

*pudeo, me pudet*, 89 ff.

Q.

'*quantum restat* ?,' 106

R.

*rien*, 176

*Roma*, 107 f.

*rubra nigra, rubus*, 136 f.

*ruma*, 107 f.

*Ruminalis*, 107 f.

S.

*scelus, sceleratus*, 213 n.

*sol*, 'shiner,' 217

T.

*tadait* (Oscan), 165

*tudet*, 93

*tango*, 88

*termen*, 177

*turben*, 177